The Power of Patriarchs

Qisong and Lineage in Chinese Buddhism

Elizabeth Morrison



BRILL

The Power of Patriarchs

Sinica Leidensia

VOLUME 94

The Power of Patriarchs

Qisong and Lineage in Chinese Buddhism

By
Elizabeth Morrison



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2010

Front cover: Photograph by Benjamin Marks of a detail from a rubbing from the collection of Wendi Adamek. The rubbing is of the carving of Indian patriarchs in the Dazhusheng ku 大住聖窟 near Lingquan Monastery 靈泉寺 in Anyang 安陽 county, Henan.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Morrison, Elizabeth (Elizabeth A.)
The power of patriarchs : Qisong and lineage in Chinese Buddhism / by Elizabeth Morrison.
p. cm.—(Sinica Leidensia, ISSN 0169-9563 ; v. 94)
Revision of the author's dissertation (Ph. D.—Stanford University, 2004).
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-90-04-18301-8 (hardback : alk. paper)
1. Zen priests—China—Lineage—History. 2. Qisong, 1007–1071. 3. Patriarchy—Religious aspects—Zen Buddhism. 4. Zen Buddhism—China—History. I. Title. II. Title: Qisong and lineage in Chinese Buddhism. III. Series.

BQ9262.9.C5M67 2010
294.3'61—dc22

2009053521

ISSN 0169-9563
ISBN 978 90 04 18301 8

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks go first to my teachers, Bernard Faure, Carl Bielefeldt, and Ellen Neskar. I am deeply grateful to each of them. Arnie Eisen, Alice Bach, and P.J. Ivanhoe all offered encouragement at crucial junctions. Janet Gyatso, who taught me as an undergraduate and set me on the path to graduate school, also provided valuable counsel as I faced the demands of graduate study.

A reading group with John Kieschnick and Wendi Adamek, both busy with dissertations but willing to meet weekly, was a highlight of my time at Stanford. The research project with which this book began arose directly out of our sessions together, and John and Wendi have been helpful for the trajectory of the project as a whole. James Robson, Hank Glassman, Max Moerman, and Michael Como also aided me in various ways during graduate school and beyond. Ari Borrell, Alan Cole, Chen Jinhua, Thomas Wilson, Morten Schlütter, Linda Penkower, and Griff Foulk all helped me significantly during the writing of the dissertation or its revision into the present work. John and Jinhua were especially generous with their help with translation work; Alan, Morten, Linda, and Griff all read the dissertation or manuscript in its entirety and offered invaluable comments.

The Chiang Ching-Kuo Foundation has twice supported me, first with a dissertation research grant in 1997–98 that allowed me several months in Kyoto and again in 2007–08 with a junior scholar grant that gave me time, including a long research trip to Taiwan, to start a new project while finishing this one. In Kyoto, Hubert Durt and Robert Duquenne of the École Française d'Extrême-Orient and Aramaki Noritoshi and Nishiwaki Tsuneki at Kyoto University were very welcoming and helpful. The Scuola Italiana di Studi sull'Asia Orientale also provided an ideal haven while in Kyoto. In Taipei, Liu Shu-fen and Paul Katz at Academia Sinica were particularly kind and helpful, both academically and personally. An Evans-Wentz Graduate Fellowship in 1998–99 also gave me additional support.

I have been very fortunate to have the colleagues I do in the Religion Department at Middlebury College. Bill Waldron, Larry Yarbrough, James Davis and Burke Rochford, in particular, have been the source of much excellent advice.

My thanks to two anonymous manuscript readers for their careful reading and many judicious comments.

I thank my parents Scott and Judy Morrison for decades of gentle, loving, unquestioning support. My brother Jay Morrison, his wife Sina Hanson, my husband's parents Peter and Jean Marks, his sister Annie Marks, his brother Sam Marks, and Sam's wife Lauren Pesso have also, in a multitude of ways, big and small, helped me complete this project. I also want to thank Jackie Scott for the ongoing series of conversations that sustains our long-distance friendship and my spirits. I also want to acknowledge Chris and Beth Keathley, who often fortified me with a cup of hot tea and a long encouraging conversation.

Finally, I thank my husband Ben Marks for his confidence in me and for years of encouragement and support as well as many wonderful distractions, including our children Sophie and Eli, who, for their part, are mystified that anyone would write a book without pictures.

ABBREVIATIONS

T. *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經, ed. Takakusa Junjirō and Watanabe Kaigyoku (Tokyo: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai, 1924–32), with volume, number, page, register and line, as necessary.

XZJ *Xu zangjing* 續藏經. Reprint of *Dai Nihon zokuzōkyō*. Taibei: Xinwenfeng, 1968–70, with volume, number, page, register, and line, as necessary.

ZZ *Dai Nihon zokuzōkyō* 大日本續藏經, ed. Nakano Tatsue (Kyoto: Zōkyō shoin, 1905–1912).

INTRODUCTION

CHINESE BUDDHISM, LINEAGE, AND QISONG

Chinese Buddhism

Chinese Buddhism, a complex and rich tradition, arose out of the convergence of classical and popular Chinese culture with Buddhist teachings and practices that began arriving from South and Central Asia in the first century of the common era. Modern scholars have struggled to understand and characterize this profoundly important cultural event, as can be seen in the title of Erik Zürcher's groundbreaking 1959 work, *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China*. In his title, Zürcher describes two distinct features of Buddhism in China: its success and its adaptation to a new cultural setting.

Quite soon after the advent of the first Buddhists, Buddhist ideas, institutions, and practices were incorporated into many aspects of Chinese culture. The ready absorption of a foreign tradition is particularly striking because before the introduction of Buddhism, the Chinese already possessed a well-developed civilization with ample religious, philosophical, and socio-political traditions of its own—and a sense of superiority to other groups. For Buddhist beliefs and practices to be so widely adopted in China is a "conquest" of sorts. At the same time, this language might be misleading. The native traditions of China, even as they reacted to and were affected by Buddhism, continued to exist and thrive. The Confucian and Daoist traditions and a wide variety of popular religious practices were neither forced underground nor rendered extinct by Buddhism.

The co-existence of the Buddhist tradition with traditional Chinese religions involved both rivalry and complementarity. It also contributed to the development of a rich array of popular religious ideas and rituals that draw on multiple traditions and defy any easy identification with the three "great traditions" of Buddhism, Daoism, and Confucianism. And, as Zürcher recognizes in his subtitle, Chinese Buddhists also consciously and unconsciously adapted the Buddhist tradition to Chinese culture. A distinct form of Buddhism emerged, abounding in doctrinal, ritual, and institutional innovation.

In considering this development, Robert M. Gimello has challenged the assumptions about essential "pure" qualities of Buddhism and Chinese culture often at work in scholarly discussions of this process and suggested that "it is at least worth entertaining the proposition that a religious tradition may change drastically and in important ways under the influence of a host culture even though its doctrinal content remains relatively constant."[1] In what follows, we will explore what may be regarded as one of the most significant of these drastic and important changes: the appearance in the medieval period of a novel source of religious authority, the *zu* 祖, or patriarch.[2]

Lineage

The Indian Buddhist tradition offers no shortage of exemplary figures, beginning with the Buddha himself. It does not, however, propose that religious authority lies in the hands of a succession of men who, alone among all Buddhists, are the full spiritual heirs of the Buddha; this powerful notion arose in China. A number of different medieval Chinese Buddhist groups, most notably the students of Tiantai Zhiyi 天台智顗 (538–597), experimented with the idea of a line of patriarchs with complete spiritual authority, but the concept received its fullest treatment in the Chan tradition. The Chan patriarchs are said to have received a "mind-to-mind transmission" initiated by Śākyamuni. Indeed, during the Tang dynasty (618–907), the Chan tradition coalesced and came into being around such claims of religious lineage. As Chan rose to dominate Chinese Buddhism during the Song dynasty (960–1279), the centrality of lineage to its legitimacy, self-conception, and success drew both critics and imitators. Ultimately, the very notion of spiritual lineage and religious patriarchs spread wide and deep in the East Asian religious world.

Some early scholars of Chan regarded Chan lineage claims as trivial and concentrated on matters of doctrine and practice. Others took the claims at face value as historically accurate. Another group of

[1] "Random Reflections on the 'Sinicization' of Buddhism," 53, 75.

[2] Gimello may even have had lineage in mind when he wrote, "Perhaps the more important changes, in our case the changes more likely to qualify as evidence of 'sinicization,' are to be found elsewhere, if at all—e.g. in the institutional forms which the tradition took, or in alterations in its patterns of personal religious behavior" ("Random Reflections on the 'Sinicization' of Buddhism," 73).

scholars, led by Yanagida Seizan, focused on unraveling the tangled skein of competing Chan lineage claims found in Tang, Five Dynasties (907–960), and early Song texts.[3] This fruitful research, partially based on texts recovered from the Dunhuang cache in Gansu province, has resulted in a thoroughly different picture of early Chan history than that provided by the tradition itself, a picture of many different groups vying for legitimacy and advocating a variety of teachings. Our understanding of early Chan history is still growing as scholars continue to identify relevant material and, in what may be considered the next stage in the scholarship, to offer new and more complex interpretations. The most recent analyses of Chan lineage and patriarchs bring to attention the central importance of the state and literati as the intended audience for (and confirmers of) lineage claims, the patronage of different groups by a variety of regional and political factions, the relation of the emergence of new literary genres to lineage claims, and hagiographical themes often at work in lineage texts. They also ponder lineage as a reaction to the 'imported' nature of Buddhist sutras and authority and as part of the larger issue of establishing the authority of Buddhism in China.[4] The present work adds to this scholarship first by examining the emergence of lineage in medieval Chinese Buddhism as a whole and then by focusing on discussions of lineage in the early Song that amount to the most articulate expressions up to that point of the self-understanding and self-narrative of the Chan tradition.

Lineage in Chinese Buddhism began as a strategy of legitimation, but as lineage became central to Chan, it came to serve a number of other purposes. The emerging Chan tradition defined itself by its ancestors, and its own self-conception and practice came to be bound up in ideas of religious lineage, often described as "dharma transmission." Recently, Robert Ford Campany, discussing the category of religion and a range of metaphors used in connection with this category,

[3] Along with Yanagida, the most important research has been done by Western scholars who studied with him, especially John McRae and Bernard Faure.

[4] See Albert Welter, *Monks, Rulers, and Literati: The Political Ascendancy of Chan Buddhism* and *The* Linji Lu *and the Creation of Chan Orthodoxy*; Wendi L. Adamek, *The Mystique of Transmission: On an early Chan history and its contexts*; Mario Poceski, *Ordinary Mind as the Way: The Hongzhou School and the Growth of Chan Buddhism*; and Alan Cole, *Fathering Your Father: The Zen of Fabrication in Tang China*. While these new analyses often contradict the conclusions of earlier scholarship, they just as frequently explore in greater depth speculations and possibilities already hinted at.

drew on Benedict Anderson to emphasize the constant self-construction of religious communities.

> We should think of the coherence of such imagined communities as something repeatedly claimed, constructed, portrayed, or posited in texts, rituals, and other artifacts and activities, rather than as simply given. Much of this claiming concerns the past: the importance of retrospective selection, organization, and classification by latecomers as they tell the stories of communities they are in the process of imagining, highlighting certain aspects of the past and creatively forgetting others, cannot be overstated. Processes of the (again often retrospective) construction of lineages and the selection and arranging of scriptural canons are places where the process of community-imagining can be observed especially clearly.[5]

Chan lineage, in other words, is not only about gaining legitimacy in the eyes of others. For much of Chan history, it has also been fundamental to maintaining the internal coherence and apparent continuity of the tradition.[6]

This study offers insight into Chan lineage—and related issues, including conceptions of religious and intellectual authority, the growth of distinctive Chinese Buddhist traditions, Buddhist relations with the state, and Buddhist views of history—through attention to Mingjiao Qisong 明教契嵩 (1007–1072), a Chan monk and dharma heir who, in his writings on Chan lineage, lays bare his part in the inventing and imagining of his tradition.[7]

Qisong

For all the richness of the Tang Chan lineage material, we are hard-pressed to know exactly what its creators really thought about their history and lineage. In what follows, close attention to Qisong will allow me to add another layer of material and a different angle of

5 "On the Very Idea of Religions (in the Modern West and in Early Medieval China)," 317.

6 For the exception, see Jiang Wu, *Enlightenment in Dispute: The Reinvention of Chan Buddhism in Seventeenth-Century China*, 41–43, on Ming dynasty (1368–1644) monks who expressed doubts about both the need for dharma transmission and what they saw as the mercenary interest of some of their contemporaries in acquiring dharma transmission.

7 I allude here not only to the work of Benedict Anderson but also to that of Eric Hobsbawn in the introductory essay of *The Invention of Tradition*.

analysis to the study of Chan lineage. When contemporaries belonging to the Tiantai tradition attacked Chan lineage as spurious, Qisong wrote extensively and passionately in its defense. He composed a new lineage history and campaigned successfully to have it, along with many of his other writings, accepted into the imperial canon. Qisong was not the only Chan figure to write on lineage during the Northern Song (960–1127), but unlike others, he engaged directly with criticism of Chan lineage, explicitly and broadly discussing the fundamental assumptions of the tradition. He exposed the foundations of the tradition, showing us what Chan history and lineage meant to an eleventh-century scholar-monk and dharma heir.

To set Qisong's writings on lineage in context, his life warrants attention, and it, in its own way, serves as a window into a seminal period of Chan history and Chinese intellectual history. As a dharma heir, Qisong lived within a monastic world increasingly organized by lineage, and his activities shed much light on the nature of Chan Buddhism and elite culture in the Northern Song. Close attention to his life also undermines common assumptions about Chan monks.[8] As a Northern Song intellectual, Qisong took part in a number of the cultural movements and debates of his day, from the revival of classical Confucian learning and ancient-style *guwen* 古文 writing to controversies over the role of Buddhism in China.

Qisong is acknowledged to have been prominent during his lifetime and influential after his death, but he has been studied relatively little. The few treatments of his life and work that have been produced fail, I argue, to provide an adequate picture of the forces that shaped Qisong and prompted him to compose his work. Nor have they considered him in the wide cultural context needed to understand him as a Song intellectual. The very diversity of his intellectual interests has led to his being studied piecemeal by scholars with either Buddhist or Confucian interests, with those researching Confucian-Buddhist interaction or syncretism looking at one set of works and those studying Buddhist history looking at another. Thus some scholars refer to him as a *ruseng*

---

[8] T. Griffith Foulk stands out as the scholar who has most forcefully argued that we cannot take sources, particularly monastic codes, at face value in their descriptions of monastic life, and recently others, especially Morten Schlütter, have been showing precisely how historical material on Chan monks often contradicts the vision of monastic life found in classical Chan literature.

儒僧, or "Confucian monk," while others call him a Chan partisan.[9] He was surely both, a fact that requires some explanation.

I do not address Qisong's so-called Confucian writings in depth, instead taking them into account as a crucial part of the overall pattern of his intellectual career and inclinations. My focus is primarily on his writings on Chan lineage—and the spectacle they present of an intelligent man struggling with historical sources in the attempt to find a way to validate the existence and importance of the lineage in which he believes deeply and participates daily. Qisong has been castigated as a dishonest historian; I reframe the issues in his writing that lead to this criticism so as to complicate and deepen our understanding of him as both a sophisticated historian and a committed Chan Buddhist unable to contemplate Buddhist history as anything but a matter of dharma transmission.

I also ask what Qisong's role in the Chan tradition of his day tells us about that tradition. What does it signify that while he devoted considerable energy to defending and articulating Chan historical claims, he barely mentions meditation or awakening? It may well be that meditation was a part of monastery life so routine as to go unremarked upon, but the complete absence of reference to the practice is striking. Similarly, he reports no awakening experience of his own; in his writings, I have come across only one such account, that of a friend's awakening, and while Qisong recorded it, he did not comment. Nor did Qisong participate in the development of the genres of *yulu* 語錄, or "recorded sayings," and *gong'an* 公案, or "public case" collections, which focus on awakening and its emergence in the meetings of masters and disciples. Qisong thus combines what scholars have often considered incompatible and decouples what scholars have usually regarded as inseparable. I offer a portrait of Qisong as a leader of a sectarian campaign, a seeker of commonalities, and an example of a figure not uncommon in the history of religions, a creative traditionalist.

Qisong is a creative traditionalist in that he values the sages of the past, especially the Buddha, and when he puts his considerable intelligence and ingenuity to work in defense of them, he creates new the-

[9] Scholars working in English have not come to any consensus on whether or how to translate *ru*; the debate on the nature and history of the *ru* tradition and whether it can properly be translated as Confucian is ongoing. Common translations include Confucian, Ruist, classicist, scholar, erudite, and literati. I will use both *ru* and Confucian.

ories and interpretations. He is, much as Campany describes above, shaping and changing the very tradition he defends. Unlike the many creative traditionalists who are creative in reaction to reform movements, however, the many attacks on the fundamental legitimacy of Buddhism and the Chan tradition were the catalyst for Qisong. To clarify the origins of Buddhism and the relation of Chan to Buddhism as a whole, Qisong became an historian, an inventive, resourceful historian piecing together scraps of sources in original configurations.

Insofar as the Chan tradition of patriarchs to which Qisong wholeheartedly subscribed was itself an invention, he was just one more in a series of writers contributing to the development of this aspect of the Chan. And yet Qisong's position in the series is crucial. He inherits centuries of lineage claims, many of which do not agree with each other, and he arranges them into a narrative while simultaneously fending off Buddhist and non-Buddhist critics. In answer to both these audiences, he asserts that Chan is the very core, the very marrow, of the Buddhist tradition, and at times he moves beyond the minutia of lineage claims into a grand historical vision. This vision, like him, is profoundly traditional and conservative even as it breaks new ground.

Outline of Chapters

Chapter One examines notions of authority and succession in early Indian Buddhism and a variety of early Chinese Buddhist attempts to lay claim to authority through reference to specific Indian figures. I also introduce a number of texts that later serve as important sources for Qisong's work on Chan lineage. Although most scholars are aware that lineage did not arise with the Chan tradition, the interpretation of lineage has focused on Chan and in particular on lineage as the result of the Chan rejection of sutras and other forms of traditional Indian Buddhist literature. I argue that the process by which lineage emerged in Chinese Buddhism was not a simple and automatic rejection of commentarial literature and then sutras in favor of patriarchs. Rather, the notion of lineage arose in fits and starts in a number of different early Chinese Buddhist groups as a supplement to or even justification of the transmission of texts and textual knowledge, and Chan lineage should be understand as merely one, albeit the most successful, variation emerging from a period of experimentation with a range of notions of India-derived authority.

Chapter Two traces the development of lineage in the emerging Chan tradition through the series of texts in which a Chan identity centered on descent from Bodhidharma emerged and was elaborated and refined. Since lineage first served to legitimate past masters but soon became a pattern to enact and live in the present, I also address the process by which lineage moves from a more or less peripheral legitimizing role to that of central substance and consider what lineage construction reveals about patriarchs, attitudes toward the past, and conceptions of authority. In addition, I identify three important developments: a shift from the creation of "the Bodhidharma school" by means of competing lineage claims, varying wildly in detail, to the defense of an increasingly standardized Chan lineage against external critics; a transition from new claims about contemporary or recent figures to the streamlining and bolstering of existing claims about the more distant past; and a move from exclusive claims meant to secure authority for one line of descent only to inclusive claims that embrace many lines of descent as legitimate.

Chapter Three gives an account of Qisong's life, which began at the margins of the empire and ended at its cultural center. In addition to providing context for the study of his writings and insight into his overriding intellectual and religious concerns, this study of Qisong's life provides a strong counterexample to common conceptions about the interests and commitments of Chan masters. Despite being a Chan dharma heir and a prolific writer, Qisong barely mentions meditation or dramatic awakening experiences. Nor does he appear to have had anything to do with the "recorded sayings" or "public case" genres. Indeed, aside from his historical writings, he wrote mainly on topics significant to the emerging neo-Confucian movement. Similarly, his identity as an heir in the Yunmen "house" of Chan lineage seems to have meant relatively little for his religious and intellectual activities; he certainly does not seem to have exhibited "Yunmen-style" teaching or behavior. In other words, this research on Qisong challenges assumptions about the correlation of religious and intellectual affiliations to lineage and even sectarian identity, at least during the late eleventh century and, I suspect, much beyond.

Chapter Four focuses on the circumstances in which Qisong wrote his works on Chan lineage and successfully promoted them at court through an energetic letter-writing campaign and a trip to the capital, a fascinating case study for the interactions of Buddhists, literati

officials, and the imperial court. I offer an account and analysis of mid-eleventh-century Tiantai attacks on Chan lineage and of Qisong's responses to such attacks, which culminated in his composition of a new Chan lineage text, a patriarchal chart, and an accompanying historiographical essay. Previous scholarship has suggested that Qisong was able to secure imperial approval (and thus inclusion in the imperial canon) for all of his works because of his writings on topics of interest to the emerging neo-Confucian movement. Through an analysis of the letters he wrote to a variety of patrons, I demonstrate that it was in fact his lineage writings that were the decisive factor in winning imperial approval, and I speculate that this was probably because the emperor at the time, Renzong 仁宗 (r. 1022–1063), was facing succession issues himself. I further argue that Qisong's account of Chan history was particularly compelling to the court and literati because he brought Buddhist and Chinese patterns of history together into a grand narrative about the need for perpetual preservation of the dharma transmission in a world wracked by misunderstanding. Given the growing sentiment among many Confucians at the time that Buddhism was harmful to the Chinese state and people, I argue that this is a valuable example of a successful Buddhist counterargument in which authority and stability within the Buddhist community are not in conflict with the Chinese imperial government but parallel to it and sharing the same need for clear succession and continuity.

In Chapter Five, I analyze in detail the first fascicle of Qisong's *Chuanfa zhengzong lun* 傳法正宗論 [Critical Essay on the True Lineage of the Dharma Transmission], the historiographical essay that accompanies his main historical work, the *Chuanfa zhengzong ji* 傳法正宗記 [Record of the True Lineage of the Dharma Transmission]. This close reading, with particular attention to Qisong's use of sources, allows a re-consideration of the negative views of Qisong frequently found in the work of modern historians of Chinese Buddhism like Chen Yuan and Jan Yün-hua. I draw attention to the sophistication of Qisong's historiographical techniques while also identifying the core beliefs that guide his readings and arguments. I argue that these expressions of his commitment to the Chan tradition—as opposed to his commitment to "truth"—are precisely what is valuable to us in his historical writings.

Chapter Six considers the second fascicle of the *Critical Essay*, in which Qisong engages directly with the questions and reactions of

critics of Chan lineage. He writes expansively about the nature and significance of the lineage in ways that Chan monks rarely did, taking on a host of issues, including the relation of the mind-to-mind transmission to the outward teachings of the Buddha, the secrecy often surrounding dharma transmission, the history of the "separate" dharma transmission as the inner or secret history of the Buddhism, and the branching of Chan lineage from a single line into multiple lines after Huineng, the Sixth Patriarch.

In concluding, I consider how the intersection of two trajectories—the centuries-long development of dharma transmission as a powerful element of Chan and other forms of East Asian Buddhism and the far briefer, but richly revealing live of Qisong—allow us to appreciate anew the interplay between particular people and the traditions that form and are, in turn, formed by them.

PART ONE

THE GENEALOGY OF LINEAGE

CHAPTER ONE

BUDDHIST NOTIONS OF SUCCESSION AND TRANSMISSION IN INDIA AND PRE-CHAN CHINA

Introduction

The idea of religious lineage, of claiming "spiritual" descent and thus authority from particular religious figures, is only one element in Chinese Buddhism, but it is an important one. The widespread acceptance of religious lineage has shaped not only institutions but the fundamental self-conception of many groups. Many different cultural sources and historical situations have contributed to the development of religious lineage, and in this chapter, we will consider the most crucial sources and circumstances.

In analyzing the development of various concepts of religious succession, transmission, and lineage in Indian Buddhism as well as early and medieval Chinese Buddhism, up to the appearance of Chan lineage, I have deliberately tried to avoid a teleological approach focused on the ultimate appearance of Chan lineage. Religious lineage emerged in several forms of medieval Chinese Buddhism and is, I argue, a widespread phenomenon of which Chan lineage is but one, albeit prominent, form. In studying the steps taken toward a full-blown notion of religious lineage originating in India and culminating in a line of Chinese patriarchs, I present each development as worthy of attention on its own, not as part of a march toward an inevitable outcome.

Religious lineage in Chinese Buddhism has been examined by scholars interested in a wide spectrum of overlapping topics, including the nature of Chinese Buddhist 'schools,' the historicity of Chan and Tiantai lineage claims, the emergence of new Buddhist literary genres, the influence of Buddhism on the medieval Confucian notion of *daotong* 道統, or 'transmission of the way,' the history of traditional Chinese education, and the development and periodization of Chan practices, institutions, and doctrines. By bringing together these often disparate discussions, we gain an overview of the emergence of religious lineage

in Chinese Buddhist thought and practice that overturns some previous assumptions while confirming others.

The emergence of Chan lineage has been thought to dovetail with three important changes in medieval Chinese Buddhism: a shift in attention from śāstra (commentarial literature) to sūtra (scripture), a transition from an emphasis on text to an emphasis on person, and growing confidence in the authority of Chinese Buddhist leaders.[1] These changes are all expressed in the Chan school, but, as what follows will demonstrate, it would be a mistake to identify the shift in attention from śāstra to sūtra too strongly with the appearance of lineage or the transition from an emphasis on text to person and the growing confidence in the authority of Chinese Buddhist leaders too strongly with Chan in particular.

In addition, the rise of Chan lineage has been linked to widespread belief in the decline of the dharma and the need to identify reliable sources of authority for Chinese Buddhism.[2] Here, too, there is evidence to suggest that these concerns also shaped lineage claims predating Chan.

Attitudes Toward Authority and Succession in Early Indian Buddhism

To understand religious lineage in Chinese Buddhism, we may begin by considering what it is not. It is not a reduplication or continuation of early Indian Buddhism; religious lineage hardly appears in Indian Buddhism, and even familial language within the monastic community was minimal.[3] Nevertheless, we find in early Indian Buddhism

---

[1] On these points, see Tang Yongtong, "Lun Zhongguo fojiao wu 'shizong,'" Stanley Weinstein, "Schools of Chinese Buddhism" and "Imperial Patronage in T'ang Buddhism," Arthur Wright, *Buddhism in Chinese History*, chap. 3–4, Judith Berling, "Bringing the Buddha Down to Earth," T.H. Barrett, "Kill the Patriarchs!" and Robert Sharf, *Coming to Terms with Chinese Buddhism*, Introduction.

[2] See Barrett, "Kill the Patriarchs!" and "Exploratory Observations on Some Weeping Pilgrims."

[3] See Shayne Neil Clarke, "Family Matters in Indian Monastic Buddhism," 5–7, for a brief discussion of the relative paucity of the language of 'fictive kinship' among Indian Buddhism monastics as well as a summary of the limited scholarship on this topic. Of course, many anthropologists argue that kinship itself is a fiction, a cultural construct, even when dependent on biological facts (Schneider, *A Critique of the Study of Kinship*; Feinberg and Ottenheimer, *The Cultural Anaysis of Kinship*; Carsten, *After Kinship*).

some resonances with lineage in Chinese Buddhism as well as some attempts at describing authority that Chinese Buddhists incorporated into their later development of the concept of lineage. We can see in early South Asian Buddhist sources a range of views about the proper sources of authority. When lists of authoritative figures appear, in both Sri Lankan and north Indian materials, they seem to assuage different concerns. As we will see, Sri Lankan anxiety about the authenticity of teachings and north Indian disquiet about the absence of the Buddha both foreshadow East Asian apprehensions and produce some of the materials used in East Asia to allay those apprehensions.

For Buddhism and other non-Vedic Indian religions, Phyllis Granoff writes that "authoritativeness of teaching had always involved a demonstration of unbroken continuity from the founder to present times."[4] But what continuity of authority—or appearance thereof—existed in the earliest Buddhist community? We lack the evidence to answer this question definitively, but at least two different possibilities appear in early material.

By most accounts, the Buddha himself spoke on the authority of his own experience and awakening, but some early texts also refer to six former Buddhas whom he met in previous lives and before whom he resolved to progress on the path. Richard Gombrich has suggested that the early idea of the six former Buddhas echoes a Vedic tradition of "seven seers" and may also have been inspired by the early Jain notions of periodic "spiritual victors" and leaders, thus verifying the teachings of the Buddha who otherwise stood on his own.[5]

We may also consider canonical accounts in which the Buddha discusses authority in the period leading up to his death. These accounts shed light on the two closely related concerns of the early Buddhist community: ensuring the faithful transmission of the Buddha's teachings

John McRae has emphasized the importance of fourth- and fifth-century Kashmiri transmission schemes, to be discussed below, to the formation of Chan lineage, going so far as to refer to the latter as "Buddhist genealogical theory with Chinese characteristics" (*Seeing Through Zen*, 5). As I attempt to demonstrate in this chapter and the next, such a description fails to acknowledge that the development of a full-blown Chan lineage system makes transmission far more central, sophisticated, and encompassing a claim than anything preceding it in South Asia.

[4] "Religious Biography and Clan History among the Śvetāṃbara Jains in North India," 196.

[5] See "Why Six Former Buddhas?" 326–30 and "The Significance of Former Buddhas," 62–72.

and determining what sort of leadership would be possible after the loss of the Buddha.

When, in the *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta*, the Buddha becomes ill, his devoted attendant Ānanda is alarmed. Ānanda consoles himself with the thought that the Buddha will not die "until he has made some statement about the order of monks."[6] The Buddha reads his mind and responds that he has no such statement to make, for two reasons. First, he has given no esoteric teachings: "'I have taught the dhamma, Ānanda, making no 'inner' and outer': the Tathāgata has no 'teacher's fist' in respect of doctrines.'" Second, he will not name a successor: "If there is anyone who thinks: 'I shall take charge of the order', or 'The order should refer to me', let him make some statement about the order, but the Tathāgata does not think in such terms.'" The Buddha goes on to offer Ānanda this advice: "Therefore, Ānanda, you should live as islands unto yourselves, being your own refuge, with no one else as your refuge, with the Dhamma as an island, with the Dhamma as your refuge, with no other refuge."[7]

In a later section of the same text, the question of how his followers are to proceed without him arises again. The Buddha explains that after his death, his students should exercise discretion in accepting the accounts of others as to what he had said or done; they must look to the *suttas*, or sermons, and *vinaya*, or monastic code, to confirm for themselves the validity of any such report.[8] Near the end of the text, the Buddha, on the verge of death, anticipates Ānanda's fear that he will no longer have a teacher and explains that "what I have taught and explained to you as Dhamma and discipline will, at my passing, be your teacher."[9] In sum, the sutta explicitly advocates relying on one's own grasp of the Dhamma and advises wariness about depending on others as leaders of the community or the source of otherwise unattested teachings.[10]

---

[6] This statement and those following occur in the *Mahāparinibāna Sutta*, translated in Maurice Walshe, *The Long Discourses of the Buddha*, 245.

[7] *The Long Discourses of the Buddha*, 569, n. 395, on whether the text refers to an island or to a lamp. Interestingly, the passage as a whole rejects the idea of the Buddha having taught an 'inner' dhamma, with a 'teacher's fist' concealing certain teachings from general audiences, as well as discouraging anyone from thinking of taking charge of the order.

[8] *The Long Discourses of the Buddha*, 255–6.

[9] *The Long Discourses of the Buddha*, 269–70.

[10] The Buddha's next instruction, however, is that after his death, younger monks are to begin referring to senior monks with honorifics, not simply as "friend," as had

The same reluctance to designate a successor also appears in an incident reported in the *Cullavaga*. In it, Devadatta, the grasping and malicious cousin of the Buddha, offers to serve as the leader of the *sangha*, or monastic community, in place of the aged Buddha. The Buddha responds, "I would not give over the Bhikkhu-samgha, Devadatta, even to Sāriputta and Moggallāna. How much less, then, to so vile and evil-living a person as you."[11]

Models of Leadership

As John S. Strong notes, such accounts in the canonical sources have sometimes given rise to the impression that the earliest Buddhist community had no 'patriarchate' despite the fact that lists of masters were later compiled in both Pāli and Sanskrit.[12] As Richard Gombrich has said, "For practical purposes, Buddhist authority was embodied in the sangha."[13] To understand the situation, we must look closely at how the transition from reliance on the Buddha to reliance on the dharma is described. We should also consider a tension that, from a fairly early period of Buddhist history, existed between a view of Buddhist leaders as Buddha-like and a view of them as 'transmitters' of the dharma.

Our limited knowledge of the early period of Buddhist history suggests that leaders of the Buddhist community did not present themselves as replacements of or analogous to the Buddha himself. Rather they defined themselves as guardians of the dharma and vinaya, with attendant religious accomplishments of their own.[14] In

---

been the custom. In other words, the equality among monks as fellow disciples of the Buddhas is to yield to an awareness of seniority and hierarchy.

[11] For Devadatta's offer to serve and the Buddha's reply, see the *Cullavagga*, trans. Rhys Davids and Oldenburg, 238–9.

[12] *The Legend and Cult of Upagupta*, 60. Étienne Lamotte, for one, seems to come to this conclusion in his *History of Indian Buddhism*, 62–4 (68–71). (In references to Lamotte, the page for the English translation is given first, followed by the page in the original French.)

[13] "Freedom and Authority in Buddhism," 16.

[14] See Wendi Adamek's comments on the tension between authority vested in teachings and monastic discipline versus charismatic authority and between orthodoxy and orthopraxy, *The Mystique of Transmission*, 58–64. Students of Chinese religion may see a parallel here with the Confucian tradition, in which Confucius pointedly denies that he has done anything but transmit the wisdom of the ancient sage-kings and seems to regard himself as the leading advocate and practitioner of their teachings but by no means their equal. On the first point, see *Analects* 7.1, on the second, *Analects* 7.33, 7.34, 9.5 and 3.14.

the *Gopakamoggallāna Sūtra*, for example, set soon after the Buddha's death, Ānanda explains to a Brahmin that no single monk possessed all the Buddha's qualities or had been appointed by the Buddha to serve as the refuge of the *sangha*. Instead, Ānanda explains, the *sangha* takes the dhamma as its refuge.[15] This stance makes sense when we remember that early Buddhism—and much of what develops from it—is largely about the aspiration for awakening. As Jonathan Silk has recently pointed out:

> [T]he Buddha is a model—of buddhahood, perfection—and his life is a model—of the path to that perfection. Why, then, does Buddhist literature on the whole not concentrate on the Buddha's life nearly as much as on his nature? The simple answer is that spiritual authority for Buddhists lies in the Buddha's awakening, in the nature he came to acquire, not in who he was in any genealogical sense—in who he was born as—nor does this nature emerge in a straightforward way from his biography.[16]

Authority, in other words, derives from the teachings and institutions that make awakening possible.

The treatment of Devadatta in canonical sources suggests that the attempt to succeed or replace the Buddha may have been made by some but was rejected, if not by the Buddha himself, certainly by those who maintained control of the tradition and composed the accounts available to us.[17] We do not know if Devadatta did in fact attempt to take over the sangha; we do know that the accusation that he did is meant to be damning.

It follows that if dharma is the only successor to the Buddha, one must establish one's own version of the dharma and/or vinaya as authoritative, as true to the Buddha, in contradistinction to versions of the dharma or vinaya held up by others. As a result, rather than a tradition of clear, widely acknowledged succession of leaders or even rival claimants to succession, we find an eventual division into competing groups based on differing recollection of the Buddha's teach-

---

[15] In *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha*, trans. Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli and Bhikkhu Bodhi, 880–6.

[16] "Incestuous Ancestries: The Family Origins of Gautama Siddhārtha, Abraham and Sarah in Genesis 20:12, and the Status of Scripture in Buddhism," 278.

[17] André Bareau points out that this depiction of Devadatta as not only responsible for the first schism but malevolent (and deserving of such a rebuke) appears only in Therāvadin and Sarvāstivādin sources ("Devadatta and the First Buddhist Schism," 25–26).

ings.[18] Evidence for this understanding of early Buddhism comes from the widespread (and conflicting) accounts of the first council, held in the aftermath of the death of the Buddha, and the second council, held some hundred years later.

Lists of Leaders in Sri Lanka

In the records of the Sri Lankan tradition, we see a new concern. These records provide lists of monks responsible for passing down elements of the Buddha's teaching from the time of the Buddha to the age of Aśoka, when, according to legend, the son of Aśoka converted Sri Lanka to the Buddhadharma. The point of these lists seems simply to be to vouch for the authenticity of the Buddhist tradition received from India, a preoccupation that also figures heavily in Chinese Buddhism. A number of texts, the earliest of which probably dates to the first century CE, offer lists of the first six *vinayapāmokkha*, or 'vinaya chiefs,' beginning with Upāli, the ex-barber who recited the vinaya at the first council.[19] As T.H. Barrett notes, "[U]nbroken continuity ever since the Buddha's lifetime is stressed elsewhere in Buddhist literature, particularly with regard to the Vinaya: presumably…any admission of discontinuity would have consequences for the validity of ordinations."[20] In keeping with their duty of transmitting the vinaya, the main virtue of these monks is reliability and adherence to tradition. The texts keep to the bare facts of birth, ordination, and succession necessary to assure readers of the existence and credentials of these monks.

Buddhaghosa, writing in Sri Lanka in the fifth century CE, describes an additional authoritative line, that of the first twenty *abhidhammācāriya*, or 'masters of abhidhamma.' The line begins with Sāriputta, continues to the age of Aśoka, and includes a number of the vinaya chiefs.[21] Like the vinaya chiefs, the masters of abhidhamma

[18] The first example may be found in the Pāli Vinaya, in which we are told that Purāṇa was not present at the council of Rājagṛha and disputed its version of the dharma and vinaya as differing from his own memory of what the Buddha had taught (Lamotte, *History of Indian Buddhism,* 125–6 (136–8), 130–1 (143)).

[19] Lamotte 203–5 (222–5). For the dating of one of these texts, the *Parivāra*, see E.W. Adikaram, *The Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, 86.

[20] "Kill the Patriarchs!" 91.

[21] Lamotte, *History of Indian Buddhism*, 87 (95) and 203–6 (223–6).

are presented as transmitters of tradition. Lamotte expresses suspicion about the historicity of this list because many of the figures included are otherwise unknown and because it is conspicuously longer than the list of vinaya chiefs.[22] But should the list of the vinaya chiefs be regarded as historically sound simply because its brevity is more credible? The remarkably long periods of service noted for each figure, ranging from thirty to sixty-eight years, seem less than realistic. And to turn from the question of historicity to that of the methods of those who drew up the lists, it may be that those responsible for the list of vinaya chiefs chose to include known figures to bolster their case, whereas those who drew up the list of abhidhamma masters opted to 'invent' personages. (As we will see, both of these strategies figure in the construction of Chinese Buddhist lineages.) Whatever the method, it is through these lines of transmission that the Sri Lankan tradition claims a direct link from the Buddha to its own vinaya and abhidhamma.

Lists of Leaders in Northern India

Sri Lankan sources do not mention or acknowledge the tradition of the five *dharmācārya*, or 'masters of the dharma,' found in Sanskrit texts from the second century CE.[23] As Lamotte writes, "We can but conclude from the silence of the Pāli sources that the legend of the five Masters was not part of the original early tradition, but was elaborated after the conversion of Ceylon."[24] Nevertheless, this legend was soon after widely accepted within India.

The tradition of the five masters of the dharma arises, it seems, from an account of the Buddha anticipating his death and entrusting his disciple Mahākāśyapa with the preservation of the dharma. This account appears in the *Aśokāvadāna*, a text of northwest India dating roughly to the second century CE but often drawing on older legends, as well as in the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*.[25] The story of this

---

[22] Lamotte, *History of Indian Buddhism*, 206 (226).

[23] Lamotte dates the notion of the 'masters of the dharma' to the second century CE. (*History of Indian Buddhism*, 223 (203)).

[24] Lamotte, *History of Indian Buddhism*, 210 (230).

[25] Strong, *The Legend of King Aśoka*, 26–7. The extant Sanskrit text does not contain this material, but a Chinese translation from around 300 CE does. See *Ayu wang zhuan*, T.50.2042.112a12–15, trans. Jean Pryzluski, *Le concile de Rājagṛha*, 23.

conversation between the Buddha and Mahākāśyapa may itself have arisen as the 'back story' for an early vinaya report that Mahākāśyapa took the lead in convening and running the first council at Rājagṛha, at which the dharma and vinaya were recited and affirmed by a large assembly of arhats.[26]

In this early vinaya account, Mahākāśyapa is aghast at the reaction of one of his fellow monks to the news of the Buddha's death. Rather than lamenting the loss of his teacher, this man happily anticipates a lifting of discipline.[27] Mahākāśyapa thus awakens to the need to confirm and uphold the Buddha's teachings and so calls the council. The next step in the development of the story has the Buddha explicitly charging Mahākāśyapa with the responsibility of protecting the dharma, thus lending further authority to Mahākāśyapa. Significantly, the tradition of the five masters of the dharma redefines Mahākāśyapa's role as one that continues past the council at Rājagṛha and is passed on after Mahākāśyapa retires from the scene.

At the council, Upāli was asked to recite the vinaya, Ānanda the sūtras, and Mahākāśyapa the *mātṛka*, precursor to abhidhamma. As we have seen, the Sri Lankan tradition gives two lists of monks, one transmitting the vinaya and thus beginning with Upāli and the other the abhidharma, which begins not with Mahākāśyapa but with Śāriputra. The tradition of the five masters of the dharma, however, derives not from the authority of the recitations but from the comprehensive role of Mahākāśyapa who had been entrusted with the preservation of the dharma.

This crucial conceptual difference may in part be related to the different roles the two types of traditions played and to the different concerns they addressed. The Sri Lankan tradition seems to have been attempting to provide names and dates to attest to the authenticity of the Buddhism received from India. The vinaya chiefs and masters of abhidhamma appear to be intended to serve as touchstones and resources; they are not described as charismatic leaders or spokesmen for the Buddhist movement. The tradition of the five masters of the dharma may have arisen out of a similar desire to link a particular place, in this case the northwest of India, with the legacy of the

[26] See I.B. Horner, *The Book of the Discipline*, v. II, 284–308. See also Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, trans., *Vinaya texts III*, 370–2.

[27] This story also appears in the *Mahāparinibbāna sutta*, trans. Walshe, *The Long Discourses of the Buddha*, 274.

Buddha. But the tradition of the five masters betrays an anxiety not so much over the need for authentic transmission of the Buddha's teachings as over the very lack of the Buddha himself. As a consequence, the masters of the dharma are described in highly dramatic terms as spiritually accomplished adepts, virtuoso preachers, and possessors of supernormal powers. As Strong puts it, the masters of the dharma are "all, in a sense, Buddhas in their own time."[28] For the king, he writes, "Buddhist monks, especially enlightened ones such as Upagupta, are not simply spiritual followers of the Buddha's teachings, they, in a sense, play the role of the Buddha in his absence and are his legitimate heirs."[29] Rather than guarantee the authenticity of teachings, these masters embody the teachings.[30] The two roles of a Buddhist leader can combine very easily, for as Strong reminds us:

> Paul Mus has pointed out that in ancient India, the notion of inheritance should be considered primarily as taking over one's father's position and identity, rather than taking over his possessions. As he puts it in his succinct manner: 'One does not inherit *from* one's father; instead, one inherits one's father.'[31]

We should not neglect at this point the importance of genre. The Sri Lankan tradition gives its lists in vinaya and quasi-historical texts, whereas the Sanskrit traditions describe them largely in *avadāna*, a genre described by Strong as "narrative of the religious deeds of an individual…primarily intended to illustrate the workings of karma and the values of faith and devotion."[32] In other words, the roles of the two types of figures correspond directly to the role they are intended to perform for the works in which they appear. And in keeping with the nature of *avadāna*, so concerned with the operation of karma, much attention is given to the prediction of the five masters of the dharma by the Buddha or at least their predecessor's magical ability to identify them, even before birth.[33]

---

[28] *The Legend and Cult of Upagupta*, 39.

[29] *The Legend of King Aśoka*, 82.

[30] *The Legend and Cult of Upagupta*, 41.

[31] *The Legend of King Aśoka*, 82, quoting *Barabuḍur* (Hanoi: Imprimerie d'Extrême-Orient, 1935), v.1, 12.

[32] *The Legend of King Aśoka*, 22.

[33] *Avadāna* focus on karma, on the consequences of deeds, and predictions often appear as part of the explanation of future events due to occur as a result of a specific action. In the case of the masters of the dharma, we see a pattern of disciples being identified and claimed without any stories of previous deeds to explain why they have

To complicate matters, the tradition of the five masters of the dharma was also invoked in the process or aftermath of the schism of the Sanskrit Buddhist world. Several mainland groups, including Sarvāstivādins, Mūlasarvāstivādins, and Sthaviras, who were competing with each other and with other religious traditions, took the five masters of the dharma as the basis for longer lists that culminate with the names of their own masters.[34]

Let us see now what of these traditions was transported to China and what the nascent Chinese Buddhist community, with its own notions of and concerns about authority and authenticity, made of it all.

Transmission to China: Early Sources and Reception

As Welter has observed, "The use of lineage to legitimize a teaching of tradition in Buddhism by tracing it back to India is by no means exclusive to Chan. All forms of Chinese Buddhism, in principle, were based on the notion of lineage, as all members of the Buddhist clergy, upon admission, were officially required to change their clan affiliation from their natal clan to their adopted Buddhist (*Shi* 釋 or *Śākya*) clan."[35] This point is an important one, although the convention of adopting *Shi* as the Buddhist monastic 'family name' arose after a period during which Chinese monks and nuns adopted the ethnikons used by their Indian and Central Asian masters.[36] And because every officially ordained monastic belonged to this 'ordination lineage,' it offered no means of distinguishing oneself or one's particular form of Buddhist philosophy or practice.

---

been born to this honor. Such stories of a master 'claiming' a child are relatively rare in China, but one interesting example is the story told by Fazang 法藏 (643–712) of the Huayan figure Dushun 杜順 laying claim to Zhiyan 智儼 when he was still a boy, albeit one whose conception had been accompanied by a dream of an Indian monk and whose early amusements were building stūpas of mud and playing dharma master. Dushun reportedly entered the house of Zhiyan's family and placed his hand on the boy's head, saying, "This is my child; let him return with me." See Gimello's translation of the passage in "Chih-yen and the Foundations of Hua-yen Buddhism," 60. In the Chan tradition, one of the strongest repetitions of this motif occurs in the *Zutang ji* 祖堂集, which describes Huineng's 慧能 joy at meeting the young Shitou Xiqian 石頭希遷 (Welter, *Monks, Rulers, and Literati*, 79).

[34] Lamotte, *History of Indian Buddhism*, 695–9 (770–5).

[35] *Monks, Rulers, and Literati*, 124.

[36] The change came about at Daoan's 道安 (312–385) suggestion, bolstered by a scriptural passage. See Zürcher, *The Buddhist Conquest of China*, 189, 281.

We have no evidence that those interested in lineage in China ever consulted the earliest Pāli canon statements on authority and succession mentioned above in the first section of the chapter, which were translated into Chinese in the fourth century. Instead, it is the *Aśokāvadāna*, translated into Chinese around 300, that marks the first known appearance in Chinese of a notion of succession of leaders within Buddhism. It is also the earliest text among the many works from which later writers of lineage texts culled names and stories. This succession within the sangha is far from a central theme in the *Aśokāvadāna*, however. It serves instead to bolster the connection between Aśoka and the Buddha by showing Upagupta, who serves as a Buddhist advisor to Aśoka, to be a direct successor to the Buddha.[37] Indeed, in none of the imported Indian texts in which such notions and/or lists appear is the succession the main concern.

Over the fifth and sixth centuries, a number of texts giving a variety of lists of authoritative teachers were translated into Chinese. Some of these texts are vinaya texts which refer to the five masters of the dharma for authority rather than to a line beginning with Upāli;[38] some also include extensions of the line of five masters that can be linked to particular Buddhist groups in northwest India.[39] The five masters of the dharma, with and without additions, also appear in a variety of texts with rather eclectic content.

One of these is the *Damoduoluo chanjing* 達摩多羅禪經 [Meditation Sūtra of Dharmatrāta], very important for those later involved in lineage construction. Buddhabhadra (359–429), a master who had studied in Kashmir, translated this text, a meditation sūtra seemingly containing both Sarvāstivādin and Mahāyāna elements, in the early

[37] As Strong notes, stories of Upagupta as the last of the five masters of the dharma are originally distinct from stories about Aśoka (*The Legend and Cult of Upagupta*, 11). However, in the Chinese translation of the text at hand, as opposed to the surviving Sanskrit recensions, the two come together in the way I have described.

[38] One exception is the Mahāsaṃghika vinaya, which was among the many important texts brought back by the intrepid Faxian 法顯 (c. 337–422). He translated it in collaboration with Buddhabhadra in 416. It contains a list of twenty-seven names presented in response to the question "From whom did you hear this dharma?" The transmission then described moves backwards in time to Upāli, "who heard it from the Buddha" (T.22.1425.492c18–493a14). Another exception is the *Shanjian lü piposha* 善見律毘婆沙, T. 24.1462, translated by Sanghabhadra in 488–9, which contains a list of twenty-four in addition to an initial list of five and a list of five active in Sri Lanka. There is also a passage describing various monks being sent to different locations. Some of those sent are on the list while others are not.

[39] See Lamotte, *History of Indian Buddhism*, 696–8 (772–4).

410s.[40] It gives a list of nine 'honored ones' 尊者 who "all upheld the dharma, handing this lamp of wisdom down in succession."[41] These nine are the traditional five masters of the dharma plus four additional names. Next to last in this list is Damoduoluo 達摩多羅, usually taken to be a transliteration of Dharmatrāta or Dharmatāra. The great master Huiyuan 慧遠 (334–416), at whose behest Buddhabhadra translated the *Meditation Sūtra*, wrote a preface to it in which he identifies Dharmatrāta as Buddhabhadra's master along with Fodaxian 佛大先, or Buddhasena.[42]

We do not know enough to say with any certainty what purpose this line of successive masters served. Was it intended as a simple guarantee of the authenticity of the meditation text in which it was provided? Was it also used to lend authority to the living master who translated it and was the disciple of the author? Huiyuan's preface also alludes to the need to record such texts in the wake of the splintering of the Buddhist community. The question of the meaning of the list is complicated by a number of discrepancies between the *Meditation Sūtra* itself and the two prefaces written for it by Huiyuan and Huiguan 慧觀 (fl. c. 400–430). McRae comments, "The sheer number of these anomalies implies an inconsistency in Buddhabhadra's reportage of his own religious background. Perhaps the very idea of defining one's religious identity by a genealogy of masters was only beginning to emerge in Buddhabhadra's native Kashmir."[43] Distinguishing between an attempt to define Buddhabhadra's religious identity per se and an attempt to authenticate the text may not be possible. Barrett has remarked that "[i]f we turn back to the transmission of the *Ta-mo-to-luo chan-ching*, we find that the line of arhats and bodhisattvas mentioned simply guarantees the text: given the text in translation, the Chinese had no further need of a line of supermen to pass it on."[44] In other words, as far as we know, during his lifetime, Buddhabhadra's

[40] Paul Demiéville, Florin Deleanu, and Nobuyoshi Yamabe have all analyzed this text and speculated on its origins. See Yamabe, "*The Sūtra on the Ocean-like Samādhi of the Visualization of the Buddha*: The Interfusion of the Chinese and Indian Cultures in Central Asia as Reflected in a Fifth Century Apocryphal Sūtra," 72–76; Florin Deleanu, "Śrāvakayāna Yoga Practices and Mahāyāna Buddhism," 4, 5–6; and Paul Demiéville, "Appendice sur 'Damoduoluo' (Dharmatrā[ta])," 48.

[41] T.15.618.301c9–10.

[42] T.15.618.301b8–9.

[43] *The Northern School*, 81.

[44] "Kill the Patriarchs!" 93.

authority extended to the text, and only later was he claimed as a spiritual ancestor.

For our purposes, what is interesting in the prefaces to the *Meditation Sūtra* is Huiyuan's description of "leading talents of the Western regions, models of meditation teaching" and Huiguan's of "heads of the teaching."[45] Huiyuan acknowledges not only Dharmatrāta but also Buddhasena, treating them as equals in talent. Huiguan's preface, meanwhile, describes nothing more than an idea that each generation contains one outstanding teacher who serves as a leader to the community, and even this is mitigated by his references to Kashmir, a particular area in which these men served as "heads of the teaching." In other words, Huiguan does not appear to attribute to these monks an exclusive and Buddha-like authority.

These lists and notions of religious succession were absorbed and transformed as an extended list of masters of the dharma began to appear in Chinese Buddhist texts. The *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan* 付法藏因縁傳 [Account of the *Avadāna* of the Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury] is identified in catalogues as a translation from the Sanskrit by Kiṅkara 吉迦夜 (fl. c. 472)[46] and Tanyao 曇曜 (fl. c. 460–480) but is now thought to be a Chinese composition drawing on translated material.[47] As is evident by the dates of the putative translators, the text presents itself as a translation done in the mid-to-late fifth century, but Henri Maspero and others have cast doubt on this date, suggesting instead that it was composed a century later.[48]

Whatever the exact date of its appearance, the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* may be seen, like the *Meditation Sūtra* and its prefaces, as intermediary steps between the Indian traditions of the mas-

---

45 T.15.618.301b10 and T.55.2145.66c27. For McRae's comments on the text and its prefaces, see *The Northern School*, 80–2. For Adamek's comments on Huiyuan's preface, see *The Mystique of Transmission*, 35–6.

46 Sanskrit reconstruction following Mochizuki 1:525. Hirakawa gives Kiṃkārya (*Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary*, 240), and Charles Willemen renders as Kikkāya (*The Storehouse of Sundry Valuables* 1–2).

47 On this text, see Henri Maspero, "Sur la date et l'authenticité du Fou fa tsang yin yuan tchouan," 129–49. Adamek discusses this text in *The Mystique of Transmission*, 101–110, as does Stuart Young, "Conceiving the Indian Buddhist Patriarchs in China," chap. 3. I plan to publish a paper on this text in the near future. For images and inscriptions based on the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan*, see Adamek 102–4 and Young 146–61 for analyses and summaries of current scholarship.

48 Maspero, 146. Adamek also argues for the later date (*The Mystique of Transmission*, 101).

ters of the dharma and later Chinese attempts to connect the masters of the dharma to Chinese figures. It does not draw on the *Meditation Sūtra*, however, and it presents a different list with a different rhetorical purpose. It describes a succession of twenty-four Indian monks, beginning with the first five masters of the dharma, who are, in essence, repositories of the Buddha's heritage. Over time, however, their knowledge and abilities dwindle. This theme of a decline in the dharma culminates in the abrupt end of the succession when a king under the thrall of non-Buddhist counselors orders the execution of the last master in the line, the ill-fated Siṃha.

Over the next few centuries, Chinese Buddhists seeking to establish a connection to the Buddha made use of the *Meditation Sūtra* and the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* in varying and surprising ways. Barrett writes, "[E]ven if these transmission lists fell short of providing a full working prototype of the patriarchal succession, they did put at the disposal of seventh-century Buddhists model chains of teacher-disciple continuity far more impressive than any available in other spheres of Chinese culture."[49] As we work through a series of references to religious succession in medieval Chinese Buddhist texts, we will see that many Chinese Buddhists, for a variety of reasons, found the idea appealing.

The Sanlun Exegetical Tradition: The First Chinese Use of Transmission

Scholars of Chinese Buddhism have long perceived that in the fifth and sixth centuries there was, as Stanley Weinstein puts it, "a growing tendency to specialize in a specific text, which was often viewed as representing the highest teaching within Buddhism."[50] These specializations began to be passed down from teacher to student. At first these groups of scholars had no institutional standing, nor did they exhibit

---

[49] "Kill the Patriarchs!" 92.

[50] "Schools of Chinese Buddhism," 2:484. Note that in his 1973 article entitled "Imperial Patronage in T'ang Buddhism," he uses the expression 'exegetical school,' but for his 1986 "Schools of Chinese Buddhism," he instead uses 'exegetical tradition.' This reflects a trend—that continues to the present—of scholars questioning the applicability of terms such as sect and school to Chinese Buddhism and trying to be more precise in their descriptions of the self-conscious identity and institutional standing of particular groups.

particular self-consciousness. Since their preferred texts were almost exclusively śāstras, that is, treatises, rather than sūtras, Tang Yongtong refers to these groups as *xuepai* 學派, which has been translated 'exegetical school' and 'exegetical tradition.'[51]

Towards the end of the sixth century, interesting statements begin to appear in the writings of members of what will come to be called the Sanlun 三論, or Three Treatises, school.[52] As we will see, these statements are not lineage claims per se, but they argue for the superiority of the śāstras they favor partially in terms of religious genealogy, drawing on some of the sources described earlier.

Ming-wood Liu has argued that "[t]he self-awareness of the Chinese students of the Three Treatises as a special Buddhist doctrinal tradition came into being largely as a reaction to the rise of the *Satyasīddhiśāstra* [Chengshi lun 成實論]."[53] In addition to the desire to defend their doctrines against students of the *Chengshi lun*, Sanlun advocates may have felt a particular need to assert the supremacy of their teachings in order to benefit from a new pattern of patronage that began in the mid-sixth century and continued under the Sui. Previously, when a large donation of property was made to an eminent master to build or maintain a monastery, at his death the state usually identified another eminent master, not necessarily with the same doctrinal interests or inclinations, to head the monastery. But in the second half of the sixth century, the personal disciples of the deceased master began to retain control of the property.[54] Due to this combination of doctrinal and economic competition, members of the Sanlun group took some steps toward a transmission theory.

The Sanlun leader Jizang 吉藏 (549–623) argued strongly for the need both for scriptural support and for a transmission of scholarship.[55] He was critical of those who could not demonstrate a connection to a known teacher, remarking of one, "But he lacked a transmission from

---

51 "Lun Zhongguo fojiao wu 'shizong,'" 15–23.

52 I use the term 'school' advisedly to indicate a group sharing a particular approach to doctrines and texts and possessing, as we will see, a modicum of self-awareness of itself as separate from and in conflict with others. On this issue, see Weinstein, "Schools of Chinese Buddhism" and T. Griffith Foulk, "The Ch'an *Tsung* in Medieval China: School, Lineage, or What?"

53 *Madhyamaka Thought in China*, 88.

54 See Ren Jiyu, *Han Tang Fojiao sixiang lunji*, 16. Note that Barrett expresses doubt whether this development applies to Chan ("Kill the Patriarchs!" 90).

55 T.45.185336c8–14.

master to disciple. The substance of one's scholarship must depend upon what one learns from one's teacher."[56] There is no indication that Jizang had in mind anything other than a relationship in which the master transmits to the disciple a set interpretation of particular texts.[57] Nevertheless, he believed such personal transmissions to be authoritative, particularly that which he himself had received. In works written in the 590s, Jizang implicitly claims a transmission from the great Kumārajīva (344–409), who translated the three texts upon which Sanlun doctrine is based and for which it is named. Jizang does not actually name Kumārajīva or list the line through which he received the transmission from him, mentioning instead places associated with either Kumārajīva and his students or with Senglang 僧郎 (n.d.), who had taught Sengquan 僧詮 (n.d.), who in turn had taught Jizang's own teacher Falang 法郎 (507–581).[58]

In his *Sanlun xuanyi* 三論玄義 [The Mysterious Meaning of the Three Treatises], Jizang also presents a brief narrative that reveals that he knew of some of the Indian traditions of transmission of the dharma as well as the tradition of the decline of the dharma. Jizang first quotes the *Mohemoye jing* 摩訶摩耶經 [Mahāmāyā Sūtra] at length. This text, translated by Tanjing 曇景 between 479 and 502, has been identified by Jan Nattier as a Mahāyāna version of the Kauśāmbī prophesy.[59] Disregarding its account of the violent end of the last arhat, Jizang focuses solely on the *Mahāmāyā Sūtra*'s schema of a series of great Buddhist leaders appearing every hundred years. He does so in order to point out the identification of Nāgārjuna, author of a large portion of the three treatises, as one of these great leaders. Jizang makes clear his view that in a time of decline, when it is not clear what is reliable,

---

[56] *Dacheng xuanlun*, T.45.1853.36c13–4. The Chinese reads, "然闕無師資相傳。學問之體。要虛須依師承習。" I owe my knowledge of this passage to Penkower, who cites it in "In the Beginning," 288, n.101. John Jorgensen also comments on it in "The 'Imperial' Lineage of Ch'an Buddhism," 100.

[57] On the question of practice, see Aaron K. Koseki, "The concept of practice in San-lun thought: Chi-Tsang and the 'concurrent insight' of the two truths." Koseki demonstrates that while some involved in Sanlun were serious practitioners of meditation, there is no evidence that Jizang himself was. The only connection between Jizang and practice of any sort is his highly theoretical discussion of how one ought to meditate on the two truths.

[58] See Linda Penkower, "In the Beginning…Guanding (561–632) and the Creation of Early Tiantai," 288. Richard H. Robinson has examined Sanlun lineage claims and suggested that there is in fact no direct connection between Kumārajīva and the line of teachers leading to Jizang (*Early Madhyamika in India and China*, 162–73).

[59] *Once Upon a Future Time*, 168–70.

the works of Nāgārjuna, who "was marvelously skilled at preaching the dharma and ignited the lamp of the true dharma and destroyed the banner of false views," are the answer.[60]

A student of Jizang known as Dharma Master Shi 碩法師 wrote a text entitled *Sanlun youyi yi* 三論遊意義, in which he makes an interesting initial move toward a transmission theory.[61] We know very little about Dharma Master Shi, but he is traditionally identified with the Sui, rather than the Tang, so we may tentatively date the text to before 618. In this text, drawing, without attribution, on the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, he states that twenty-three men transmitted and upheld the dharma treasury. A question is then posed about the line of transmission from the eleventh master, Aśvaghoṣa, to the disciple of the fourteenth, Kāṇadeva, and Dharma Master Shi gives an innovative answer. He follows the line given in the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* for the four figures, Aśvaghoṣa, Kapimala, Nāgārjuna, and Kāṇadeva but, rather than name Rāhula 羅睺羅 as Kāṇadeva's disciple, as does the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, he names Kumārajīva.[62] Dharma Master Shi then states that the line continued until Siṃha.[63] The implication is even if, according to the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, the line of transmission came to an end with Siṃha, one need not worry. Thanks to Kumārajīva, the translator of all three of the three treatises for which the Sanlun is named and the master to whom Jizang had implicitly claimed a connection, the true teachings of the Buddha are preserved in the Sanlun school.

---

[60] T.45.1852.6b10–24. The line translated is b21. Later in the same work, Jizang also narrates the events in the immediate aftermath of the death of the Buddha. He writes, "[Mahā]kāśyapa transmitted the three baskets to three masters: sūtras to Ānanda, Abhidharma to Purna, vinaya to Upali" (T45.1852b15–17). When Ānanda left the world, Jizang reports, the sūtras were transmitted through a series of six men over a period of two hundred years, but after the death of the last man, around three hundred years after the death of the Buddha, the transmission divided into two lines (T.45.1852.9b15–29). Alan Cole argues that Jizang's claiming of Nāgārjuna is crucial for our understanding of Guanding's choice to do the same (*Fathering Your Father*, 61).

[61] Tang Yongtong's "Zhongguo Fojiao zongpai wenti bulun," a little-known 'additional discussion' that goes far beyond his well-known 1962 article, "Lun Zhongguo fojiao wu 'shizong,'" drew my attention to this passage.

[62] For transliteration of Rāhula, I follow Maspero ("Sur la date," 142), rather than Yampolsky (*Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*, 8). See Young's helpful discussion ("Conceiving the Indian Buddhist Patriarchs," 136).

[63] T.45.1855.116c27–117a3. In 116c26, I read *yangzi* 仰子 as an error for *shizi* 師子, the transliteration for Siṃha.

This passage by Dharma Master Shi marks one of the earliest, if the not the earliest, uses of the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* to link a line of Indian figures with China and perhaps the first attempt to support a particular Chinese Buddhist group with reference to such a line.[64] Note, however, that Dharma Master Shi does not go beyond Kumārajīva. To invoke him is apparently sufficient. This suggests that Dharma Master Shi did not necessarily expect that the authority of the Indian line continued in China through a series of individuals. It offers instead an authority for the foundations of the Sanlun movement. In other words, he did not necessarily envision a Chinese counterpart to the line described in the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*. Nor did Dharma Master Shi describe the Indian transmission in any way that suggests anything other than a transmission of authoritative knowledge of the dharma to which both the primary author and the translator of the three treatises belongs.

Dharma Master Shi's text continues with another rather revealing question: "From Dharmaśri and Harivarman down to [Ka]tyayana and Dharmatrāta, to whom was it transmitted?"[65] None of these four names appears in the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*. The first two figures mentioned are the authors of the *Abhidharmahydaya* and the *Chengshi lun*, respectively, two texts whose study rivaled and often surpassed that of the Three Treatises.[66] The second two are major Sarvāstivādin figures.

Not surprisingly, Dharma Master Shi is dismissive of these figures. He answers, "This is a transmission of all the śāstra exegesis masters of a different group, not the transmission of the dharma treasury. This is what Aśvaghoṣa and Nāgārjuna were trying to destroy."[67] This pointed dismissal of these Indian figures is, of course, simply the inverse of the claims being made about Kumārajīva: our Sanlun spiritual ancestors are authoritative and your Chengshi ancestors are not. But it may also address a specific problem: Kumārajīva, whom Dharma Master Shi has just identified as a member of the transmission, translated not only the Three Treatises but also the *Chengshi lun*. By specifically

[64] The tentative language here is due to our lack of a date for Master Shi's text as well as the uncertainty of dating the various revisions of the other possibility, Guanding's preface to the *Mohe zhiguan*, discussed in the next section.
[65] T.45.1855.117a4.
[66] The former text is the *Apitanxin jing* 阿毘曇心論, T.28.1550.
[67] T.45.1855.117a4–5.

excluding Harivarman, the author of the *Chengshi lun*, Dharma Master Shi is downplaying the importance of the *Chengshi lun* while binding Nāgārjuna to Kumārajīva not merely as author and translator but also senior and junior members of the same authoritative transmission.

Weinstein has described Sanlun as standing "halfway between the exegetical traditions of the sixth century and the full-fledged schools of the T'ang dynasty," and while we might question just how fully formed these various traditions were in the Tang, in relation to the emergence of ideas of lineage, Sanlun certainly hovers at the threshold of a significant transition.[68] Indeed, let us pause to consider that these ideas of transmission appear in Sanlun circles in relation to understanding exegetical texts as opposed to sūtras or practices. It has been argued that the very notion of patriarchal transmission, though formed in texts, exists in opposition to textual transmission and in particular in opposition to exegetical texts. It appears to be more complicated than that. Members of 'exegetical' schools based on śāstras did not limit themselves to arguing for the superiority of the content and doctrine of their chosen texts; they also made historical and extra-textual arguments for the authoritativeness of their texts, and this may very well have contributed to lineage discourse.[69]

Tiantai Reaction to Sanlun and Another Claim on Nāgārjuna

Just as Sanlun advocates reacted to the prominence of other schools, like the Chengshi, focused on the interpretation of Indian texts, the growing prestige of the Sanlun in the late sixth century prompted a response from the nascent Tiantai community to produce "the first known attempt of any kind to define a Chinese teacher (or text) in terms of a succession theory."[70] As we will see, this attempt was the result of experimentation with a variety of sources and stories as well as a reaction to a convergence of needs.[71]

[68] "Schools of Chinese Buddhism," 485.

[69] On some of these issues, see Young, "Conceiving the Indian Buddhist Patriarchs in China," chap. 4.

[70] Penkower, "In the Beginning," 268. In what follows I draw heavily on this valuable article, which summarizes previous scholarship on lineage in early Tiantai and advances it considerably.

[71] See the second chapter of Alan Cole's *Fathering Your Father* for comments on the particular circumstances of the use of Buddhism to the Sui state.

This first lineage claim in Chinese Buddhism, made at some point between 607 and 632, predates the emergence of the Chan school;[72] it appears in an early seventh-century work by Guanding 灌頂 (561–632), a disciple of the great Zhiyi 智顗 (538–597), revered by the Tiantai tradition as its founder. Attention to Guanding's statement reveals textual sources, cultural resonances, and political factors important in the creation of Tiantai and Chan lineage. (A close reading also prepares us for the conflicts over lineage between the Chan and Tiantai schools during the Northern Song dynasty that prompted Qisong to write extensively on Chan history.)

To set the scene for Guanding's claim, we need to know that in an earlier text Guanding had already attempted to connect Zhiyi to the Buddha in a different manner. In his 605 biography of Zhiyi, Guanding claims that in previous lives both Zhiyi and his teacher Huisi 慧思 (515–577) attended Śākyamuni's preaching of the *Lotus Sūtra*. In the same biography, Guanding also describes another source for Zhiyi's teachings. According to this account, Buddhabhadra and his Chinese student Xuangao 玄高 (402–444) advocated a balance of meditation and wisdom.[73] After a period of disuse and deterioration, Huisi resurrected their teachings and passed them on to Zhiyi.[74] Note that Śākyamuni is nowhere to be found in this version of Zhiyi's religious heritage. Is he simply implied in Buddhabhadra's origins? I wonder if Guanding, though he does not make reference to any textual or oral tradition concerning Buddhabhadra, in fact identifies him as a source for Zhiyi's teaching because of an association between Buddhabhadra and a line of Kashmiri Sarvāstivādin masters supposedly connected to the first five "masters of the dharma." (Of course, this association also concerns the doctrine and meditation taught by Buddhabhadra.) If

[72] For views of the dating of the second and third editions of the *Mohe zhiguan*, see Penkower's summary of relevant Japanese scholarship, "In the Beginning," 270–2. And how are we to define the emergence of the Chan school? Some scholars begin with lineage claims to Bodhidharma, which, as we will see below, began in the late seventh century. Others have looked for the appearance of certain statements about doctrine and practice. T. Griffith Foulk has argued strongly that the Chan school cannot be said to exist until it has a firm institutional basis, which happens in the early Song ("The 'Ch'an School' and Its Place in the Buddhist Monastic Tradition").

[73] Intriguingly, Xuangao may have been the teacher of Tanyao, the translator—or, more likely, author—of the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*.

[74] As both Tang Yongtong and Penkower note, the relationship between Buddhabhadra and Xuangao seems unlikely given the disparity in age and Buddhabhadra's expulsion from Chang'an in 410 (*Han-Wei Liang-Jin Nanbeichao fojiao shi*, 353 and "In the Beginning," 280–1).

this speculation is correct, the Buddhadhadra/Xuangao claim may be Guanding's first inchoate gesture toward lineage, perhaps made before Guanding encountered the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*.

Guanding might have been aware that Buddhabhadra had a special claim to authority, or he might have been familiar with the textual sources for this association, which, as we will see, became important sources for the creation of Chan lineage. As described earlier, Buddhabhadra describes his line in the *Meditation Sūtra*, a text he translated in the early 410s. Another possible source for Guanding's perception of Buddhabhadra is Sengyou 僧祐 (445–518), who included in his *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集 [Compilation of Notices on the Translation of the Tripiṭika] a summary of the line of fifty-odd Indian masters to which Buddhabhadra could lay claim through his master, Buddhasena.[75]

Yet another possibility is that Guanding identified Buddhabhadra as Zhiyi's religious ancestor in reaction to claims made by the Sanlun leader Jizang. Guanding, who not only read Jizang's writings but seems to have borrowed from them when compiling works in Zhiyi's name, may have been responding to Jizang and his student Dharma Master Shi in his attempts to develop a lineage for Zhiyi.[76] Scholars trying to understand Guanding's lineage claim have previously looked at the rivalry with Jizang and Sanlun but have not considered the issue of Guanding's previous reference to Buddhabhadra. In naming Buddhabhadra, Guanding may have been setting this Indian master against Kumārajīva, in whom, as we have seen, Dharma Master Shi's claim culminates. Indeed, Buddhabhadra, who arrived in Chang'an during Kumārajīva's tenure there, advocated different doctrines and stricter discipline. He was regarded as a sufficient threat by Kumārajīva's followers that after Kumārajīva's death he was exiled from the capital and had to seek refuge with Huiyuan at Mt. Lu. Weinstein has conjectured

[75] This section of the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, T.2145.88c–90a, consists of Sengyou's preface, entitled "Preface to the Table of Contents of the Account of the Sarvāstivāda Work," and a summary of the five fascicles of a work, itself no longer extant, entitled "Brief Account of the School Lineage of the Sarvāstivādin Buddhabhadra of the Neizhai gongsi in Chang'an." It takes the form of two closely related lists of names.

[76] On Guanding's use of Jizang's writings, see the work of Hirai Shun'ei, *Hokke mongu no seiritsu ni kansuru kenkyū*. On the varied accounts of the relationship between Jizang and Guanding, see Chen Jinhua, *Making and Remaking History: A Study of Tiantai Sectarian Historiography*.

that Kumārajīva was not included in the Tiantai lineage because he was a translator.[77] Jizang's claim on Kumārajīva may be another reason.

Whether or not this speculation regarding Buddhabhadra as a rival ancestor to Kumārajīva has any basis, competition with Jizang and the Sanlun tradition certainly forms part of the background for Guanding's efforts on the behalf of Zhiyi and the Tiantai communities he founded. Intellectual 'schools' had already begun to develop when the first Sui emperor "set up monasteries under specified masters to teach a particular doctrine or text."[78] State patronage played a crucial role in the formation of institutionally distinct groups of Chinese Buddhists, an effect we will see at work in the Northern Song (960–1127) as well.

When Guanding made the final revision of his introduction to the *Mohe zhiguan* 摩訶止觀 [Great Calming and Contemplation], his record of lectures given in 594 by his master Zhiyi, he offered yet another set of arguments for Zhiyi's authority. He begins by identifying the sources of Zhiyi's knowledge, and the first of them is lineage.[79] As Guanding puts it, "If a practitioner hears the transmission of the treasury of the dharma, he will recognize the origins of [our ancestral] line."[80] Guanding then summarizes the life of the Buddha, which concludes with his transmission of the dharma to his disciple Mahākāśyapa. The passage continues with Mahākāśyapa, in turn, transmitting the dharma to Ānanda and so on for a series of twenty-three Indian monks in total.[81]

---

[77] "Imperial Patronage in the Formation of T'ang Buddhism," 273.

[78] See Jorgensen, "The 'Imperial' Lineage of Ch'an Buddhism," 99, n.49.

[79] Penkower points out that Guanding is innovative not only in his assertion of lineage but also in the placement of the lineage account before either theoretical or scriptural support for Zhiyi's teaching. She also notes that Satō Tetsuei's work on redactions of the *Mohe Zhiguan* makes clear that Guanding's preface changed as the text went through three editions. The statement on lineage did not appear in the first edition, which was probably finished in 597. It appeared, less prominently, in the second edition, which was completed around 605, and was given its current position near the beginning of the preface in the third edition, which appeared sometime between 607 and 632 ("In the Beginning," 269–71).

[80] T.46.1911.1a13, as translated by Penkower, "In the Beginning," 254. The Chinese reads, "行人若聞付法藏。則識宗元." As Penkower notes, the first phrase may be understood as a direct reference to the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, discussed below as a source for Guanding's statement.

[81] At the end, one more Indian monk, Madhyāntika, is mentioned as having received the dharma from Ānanda together with Śaṇavāsa, and though he did not transmit the dharma, he is included in the final count of twenty-four.

Guanding drew the names and the stories associated with them from the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, the same source used by Dharma Master Shi of the Sanlun group. It is not at all clear how Guanding understood the line of Indian Buddhist figures presented in the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*; his only general comment is that "[t]he teachers all received the prediction from the golden mouth [of the Buddha]" and were sages capable of helping many people.[82] It has often been assumed that the prediction to which Guanding refers is the prediction of future Buddhahood.[83] The *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* itself does not include predictions of Buddhahood; rather it contains predictions of the appearance of some, not all, of those who will inherit the dharma.[84] The question, of course, is how Guanding read the text, and that, unfortunately, is unclear.

Guanding lists the figures, with the phrase 'the dharma was transmitted to' preceding the name and, for most, a few words recounting an event or achievement following it. These truncated biographical accounts do not show any particular pattern or add up to any sort of coherent composite portrait or model. Nor do they shed any light on the relationship between figures in the line or how the dharma was transmitted from one to another. Instead, it seems that Guanding simply drew the names of monks from the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, along with a few biographical details to give the appearance of historical reality. He reports the violent death of the last figure, Siṃha, but does not comment on it or the related and extensive discussion of the decline of the Buddhist dharma in the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*.[85]

After laying out this line of Indian masters, Guanding tells us that Zhiyi learned a set of three forms of meditation from Huisi, who had learned these contemplative techniques from Huiwen 慧文 (fl. mid-sixth century).[86] Huiwen, Guanding explains, developed these meditative

[82] T.46.1911.1b8.

[83] Not exclusively a Mahāyāna trait but interestingly the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, despite its inclusion of Mahāyāna figures, is mainly concerned with the death of the dharma, which Jan Nattier has shown to be a pre-Mahāyāna or at least not exclusively Mahāyāna concern (*Once Upon a Future Time*).

[84] On the two basic types of predictions—of future enlightenment and of particular events—in avadāna literature, see Strong, *The Legend and Cult of Upagupta*, 23–4.

[85] See Barrett, "Kill the Patriarchs!" 91–2.

[86] Alan Cole raises doubts about Huiwen's historicity (*Fathering Your Father*, 56–58). In the two lines of transmission Guanding sets out in his introduction to the *Mohe Zhiguan*, Penkower sees a tension between received and inspired truth. The

techniques after reading the *Dazhidu lun* 大智度論, a work attributed to the Indian master Nāgārjuna (and now thought by scholars to be the work of its "translator," Kumārajīva).[74] Tiantai is usually identified as one of the 'sinitic' schools of Chinese Buddhism because of the prominence of a Chinese 'founder' and of the attention to a sūtra as the central text, but, as we see here, Guanding identifies a śāstra as the text of most importance.

Guanding, like Dharma Master Shi, is trying to establish a link to Nāgārjuna. Though his treatment of the Indian line of teachers is less abbreviated than that of Dharma Master Shi, he is similarly indifferent to the seeming demise of the dharma because he believes it to have been continued elsewhere. But whereas Dharma Master Shi esteemed Nāgārjuna in relation to texts, Guanding favors Nāgārjuna as a person. Zhiyi had reportedly called Nāgārjuna his teacher. For Guanding, Zhiyi is the focus of attention, and Nāgārjuna is meaningful because Zhiyi had identified him in this way. Guanding also goes beyond Dharma Master Shi in describing a Chinese line of masters who are linked to Nāgārjuna and thus to the Buddha himself. Guanding further suggests that the transmission involves the practice of meditation and the insight that derives from it, a crucial development in the conception of the transmission.

Guanding's lineage claim, as Penkower notes, appears as part of a much larger effort to consolidate Zhiyi's legacy and secure continued imperial patronage for the monastery communities he established, especially the Guoqing monastery, which Zhiyi conceived but did not live to see completed.[87] However, we still do not know why Guanding

---

Indian line involves transmission, whereas Huiwen initiates the Chinese line through his intuitive reading of a text. Penkower makes the important point that the discontinuity in the succession is not an obstacle; indeed, such discontinuity in the founding myth of Tiantai helped later 'revivers' of Tiantai lay claim to the tradition. However, Penkower's characterization of a textual Indian line and a contemplative Chinese line assumes, I believe, the textual nature of the Indian transmission described in the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* and adopted by Guanding ("In the Beginning," 263). The *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* includes references to the (slowly diminishing) transmission of meditative technique but does not mention texts. It presents a line of masters primarily as an expression of the decline of the dharma. The death of the last in the line underscores not so much the loss of the dharma itself—for the final lines of the text exhort readers to protect the dharma—but the loss of confidence that the dharma has been preserved in India and the vulnerability of the dharma to persecution. As Maspero first argued, the text was probably composed in response to a persecution of Buddhism under the Northern Wei ("Sur la date").

[87] "In the Beginning," 274.

went beyond his earliest efforts to provide Zhiyi with suitable ancestors. What are we to make of the differing means by which Zhiyi is connected to him?[88] Since Guanding was certainly driven to compete with other groups, Dharma Master Shi's *Sanlun youyi yi* statement may have spurred him to invent and then elaborate a pedigree, though the dating of the text is too uncertain to say. Regardless, Guanding's claim of a link between Buddhabhadra, Xuangao, and Zhiyi resembles Jizang and Dharma Master Shi's statements of transmission both in its lack of elaboration and its relative unimportance. Guanding's later statement in the *Mohe Zhiguan* is rather different.

Penkower draws attention to the fact that although Guanding arranges the Indian figures chronologically in the *Mohe Zhiguan*, he begins in China with Zhiyi and works backwards through his two predecessors, a pattern she identifies as that of imperial genealogies, which begin with the founding figure and trace the lineage back in time. This pattern, centered on Zhiyi, suggests that Guanding did not intend to set himself (or anyone else) up as the next in line. (As we will see, this contrasts starkly with some early uses of lineage in the emerging Chan community.) Penkower argues that Guanding composed lineage accounts largely to keep the monasteries founded by Zhiyi within the control of his students.[89]

This interest in protecting community property sheds light on Guanding's relationship to the lineage he describes. He does not name a successor to Zhiyi. Were he to have done so, it is unclear whom he would have named. Would lineage have been tied to leadership of the monasteries? Given that he did not serve as abbot at any of the monasteries Zhiyi founded, it is not clear that Guanding was positioning himself for this honor, even if the next generation bestowed it on him. What is clear is that Guanding, in composing a lineage claim for his teacher, defines it, as Penkower has demonstrated, in terms of a balance between learning and meditation.[90] The role of lineage in this case is not only to demonstrate authority but to express the teaching backed by that authority.

---

[88] Some scholars have understood the two accounts as reflecting reliance or identification with, on the one hand, the *Dazhidu lun* and its purported author Nāgārjuna and, on the other, the *Lotus Sūtra*. This may well be valid, but as Penkower demonstrates, many factors went into the creation of Tiantai lineage ("In the Beginning").

[89] "Making and Remaking Tradition: Chan-jan's Strategies Toward a T'ang T'ien-t'ai Agenda," 331 (8).

[90] "In the Beginning," 254–55.

Why Lineage?

Guanding's various attempts to cloak Zhiyi in an authority beyond the prestige generated by his own conduct and erudition raise many interesting questions. For our purposes, the most pressing is what lay behind his choice to make his final and most prominent claim in terms of lineage. As Guanding's assorted efforts to link Zhiyi to figures of Buddhist authority demonstrate, lineage is not the only method to accomplish this goal. In Guanding's account of Zhiyi attending Śākyamuni's preaching of the *Lotus Sūtra*, past lives offer the possibility of claiming a connection to authority.[91] Against this possibility, religious lineage looks positively mundane. It is also astonishingly overdetermined. In China, as in so many traditional societies, succession by male descent frequently determined who held political and familial power, making lineage so obvious a source of authority as to be almost invisible as a choice.[92] Was the Buddhist use of genealogical claims a matter of retaining control of property, especially in the case of imperially-sponsored monasteries over which the state might understandably assert control? Was it a way to assert ownership in a manner consonant with the initial bestowal of the property by a court also ruled by genealogy?

Jorgensen ascribes the success of eighth-century Chan and its lineage-based claims in part to rising elite interest in genealogy.[93] This interest in genealogy, however, goes back much earlier. In the early seventh-century, for example, the third edition of the *Mohe Zhiguan* came out just before a national genealogy, *Zhenguan shizu zhi* 貞觀氏族志 [Treatise on the clans of the Zhenguan Period (627–649)],

[91] Another possibility for asserting authority is to describe how an authoritative ancient text was 'discovered.' This strategy appears in Tibet in the *gterma*, or treasure, tradition (see Janet Gyatso, "The Logic of Legitimation in the Tibetan Treasure Tradition"). Such treasures are usually revealed through dreams and visions, which in other situations, also offer an independent means of direct contact with Buddhas. Although such stories were known by the early fifth century in China through Indian accounts of Nāgārjuna's life which attribute the seeming novelty of his teachings to a gift of texts from the nāgā-king, the Chinese did not pursue this strategy.

[92] On early and powerful Chinese notions of lineage as politically and religiously significant, see David Keightley, "Early Civilization in China: Reflections on How It Became Chinese," 31, 35, 46.

[93] "The 'Imperial' Lineage of Ch'an Buddhism," 125–6.

that ranked prominent families.[94] Historians have seen a connection between the power of the aristocracy and the waxing and waning of interest in genealogies, which would suggest that by the time Qisong was writing in the mid-eleventh century, when the aristocracy had been largely displaced, lineage was no longer of interest to the elite. In fact, there seems to have been a resurgence of interest in genealogical writing in the mid and late eleventh century, including its promotion by Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修.[95] In addition, as I suggest in a later chapter, whatever the general interest in genealogy, the imperial court was always deeply concerned with issues of legitimacy and succession.

The adaptation of traditional Chinese genealogical patterns for Buddhist purposes was almost certainly made easier by two factors in pre-existing Chinese culture. The first of these is the close relationship in China of leadership and morality. Whatever the reality, leaders, whether of the state or the family, were expected to lead by moral example. This emphasis on morality led to a striking ambivalence about hereditary succession in the political arena. Merit figures heavily in the early Chinese discourse about succession. The paradigmatic story is that of the sage-king Yao 堯, who chose the filial Shun 舜 as his successor over his own, less worthy, son. Yao did not adopt Shun as his son, but he made him the heir to the throne. The importance of worthiness over and above biological descent pervades treatments of the notion of *tianming* 天命, or the mandate of Heaven. It also helps us understand how Confucius might have understood his relationship to the Zhou past. The *Analects* 7.1 offer his assertion that "I transmit but do not create," and it is evident that Confucius's very response to the ways of the Zhou, his attention and faithfulness, are what qualify him to transmit them. As Chinese Buddhists attempted to find their footing within the complex and diverse legacy of Buddhism, indigenous notions of worthy individuals may very well have influenced the

---

[94] This work attracted the ire of the emperor Taizong (r. 626–49), who felt that high officials in his service deserved a more exalted status than the scions of the great eastern clans celebrated in the genealogy. See David Johnson, *The Medieval Chinese Oligarchy*, 48–53. The controversy continued, with revised genealogies appearing until 713.

See also the comments of Cole, drawing on Wechsler and Twitchett (*Fathering Your Father*, 85–86).

[95] Beverly J. Bossler, *Powerful Relations: Kinship, Status and the State in Sung China (960–1279)*, 13–14, and Patricia Buckley Ebrey, *Women and the Family in Chinese History*, 107–43.

formation of the concept of a non-biological lineage based on merit and on the notion of leaders who are willing to disregard family claims for those of the virtuous.

A second factor is the way master-disciple relationships both in classical learning and in realms of religious and practical expertise had already been understood in familial terms. As Thomas H.C. Lee notes, in the Warring States period and beyond, 'schools' of classical learning were known as *jia* 家, or families, with an emphasis on "scholarly orthodoxy and personal relationship."[96] Lee also remarks that the "use of the family or residence analogy…to define the concept of *men-jen* or *men-sheng* (lit. disciples or students [at the] gate) was to become a permanent feature in treatises on the idea of discipleship in Chinese intellectual history."[97] Further indication of this is the use of the term *dizi* 弟子, referring to a younger brother or son, for students or disciples.[98] (Lee rightly notes that while the significance of the Buddhist monastic model for the neo-Confucian academies in the Song is widely recognized, few have considered the Chinese influence on Chinese Buddhist notions of master-disciple relations, including the use of the term *dizi*.)[99]

The Han Emperor Wu 武 (r. 141–87 BCE) required that those serving him as court scholars, the 'erudites,' were legitimate disciples of recognized scholars.[100] In other words, classical scholars were to be well-trained in and faithful to their particular tradition, just as sons should be to their families. Indeed, the master-disciple relationship demanded not only loyalty to a particular intellectual heritage but also ritual expressions of the bond, including official mourning periods.[101] Lee also notes that the ever more exalted status of the teacher in the late Han sometimes counteracted the earlier emphasis on a close personal relationship.[102] This status did not last; indeed, in the Tang, argues Lee, an "unbroken line of succession was no longer an essential concern. As long as one could seek unity with the original teaching, one could serve as a good teacher."[103] This attitude may not have

---

96 Thomas H.C. Lee, *Education in Traditional China: A History*, 190–1.
97 Lee, *Education in Traditional China: A History*, 543–4.
98 Lee, *Education in Traditional China: A History*, 545.
99 Lee, *Education in Traditional China: A History*, 564.
100 Lee, *Education in Traditional China: A History*, 200.
101 Lee, *Education in Traditional China: A History*, 200–1, 226–7, 554–7, 561–2.
102 Lee, *Education in Traditional China: A History*, 227.
103 Lee, *Education in Traditional China: A History*, 268.

persisted long, however, for as David McMullen describes, in the late Tang "a sense of discipleship" arose among young men in pursuit of official careers who, finding official education inadequate, sought out both private teachers and patrons within the government.[104] McMullen also points out that ninth-century Confucians saw in Buddhism "much more effective emphasis on personal discipleship than did the state Confucianism of the seventeenth and early eighth centuries" and speculates that "the sense of loyalty associated with Buddhist or Taoist teachers was transferred to the more general social context of the scholarly bureaucracy."[105]

In the Heavenly Masters 天師 movement of the late Han, leadership was hereditary for the first few generations.[106] (An hereditary succession asserted itself again later, though scholars debate its connection to the original Heavenly Masters.)[107] In the meantime, however, Kou Qianzhi 寇謙之 (365–448) eschewed the hereditary principle to describe himself as the latest in a line of masters beginning with the first Heavenly Masters. Beyond that dispute, in circles encompassing what Campany calls "the masters of esoterica (*fangshi* 方士) and practitioners of longevity and transcendence arts," from the late Han on, authority was usually understood to derive from encounters with deities, the texts thus revealed, and special rituals;[108] the transmission of these texts and rituals led to various lineages, which are not very well documented, in part because they were often secret (and frequently because they were retrospectively constructed).[109] Despite our incomplete knowledge of these transmissions and lineages, we can have no doubt of their significance, symbolic and otherwise. Ge Hong 葛洪

---

[104] *State and Scholars in T'ang China*, 48.

[105] *State and Scholars in T'ang China*, 49. Mark Halperin describes the literati Liang Su's (753–793) devotion both to a scholarly patron and to the Buddhist master Zhanran (*Out of the Cloister*, 32–5).

[106] See Terry Kleeman, *Great Perfection: Religion and Ethnicity in a Chinese Millennial Kingdom*, 66–78. See Stephen Bokenkamp, *Early Daoist Scriptures*, 217, third note, on a fifth-century text according to which only the first three leaders were properly regarded as Celestial Masters.

[107] See T.H. Barrett, "The Emergence of the Taoist Papacy in the T'ang Dynasty," as well as *Daoism Handbook*, 349, 415–6, 417, and 420, for sources.

[108] Campany, "Secrecy and Display in the Quest for Transcendence in China, ca. 220BCE–350 CE," 293; Bokenkamp, *Early Daoist Scriptures*, 10–12.

[109] On the rhetoric and functions of secrecy, see Campany, "Secrecy and Display in the Quest for Transcendence in China, ca. 220 BCE–350 CE."

(c. 283–343), for example, emphasized the great importance of having a teacher.[110]

Lineage as a Response to the Decline of the Dharma

In addition to a Chinese predisposition to conceive of relationships in terms of family and a rising interest in genealogy, another factor was quite possibly affecting Guanding's choice of lineage: the pervasive fear of the decline of the dharma (and attendant persecution of Buddhists). Beginning in the mid-fifth century, Chinese Buddhists became increasingly aware that, according to some texts, the Buddha had predicted the decline and death of his teachings.[111] These Indian Buddhist notions of decline appeared at a particularly chaotic period in Chinese history, when many Chinese Buddhists were ready to believe that the time of the decline had indeed come.[112] Since warfare between small states continued until the end of the sixth century, it may have been very easy to believe that the world and the dharma were in decline.

However, when Dharma Master Shi and Guanding borrowed the notion of an Indian succession from the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* and then connected it, more or less explicitly, to China, they implicitly contravened the narrative of decline. Guanding asserted, rather hopefully, that such lapses in the transmission could be mended or overcome by contemplative insight. (As we will see, Chan ideas of transmission will similarly reject the narrative of decline, albeit by a different mechanism and with a different message.) We should recognize, though, that despite his own relative optimism, Guanding may in part have felt the need to assert Zhiyi's authority because of

---

[110] Lee, *Education in Traditional China: A History*, 228.

[111] See David W. Chappell, "Early Forebodings of the Death of Buddhism," Nattier, *Once Upon a Future Time*, and Jamie Hubbard, *Absolute Delusion, Perfect Buddhahood.*

[112] This process may in fact be seen as a reprise or continuation of the circumstances surrounding the introduction of Buddhism to China. It has long been argued that Buddhism was widely accepted in China in large part because its arrival coincided with a period of political and social disorder, when its teachings seemed particularly apt. In particular, it is thought that as a result of the disorder leading up to the fall of the Han dynasty in the third century and the turbulence thereafter, many educated Chinese believed that the teachings of Confucius (and Legalist policies) had lost their power to explain or prevent the suffering and disorder so much in evidence. See, for example, Arthur F. Wright, *Buddhism in Chinese History*, 24, 34. 40; Erik Zürcher, "Buddhism in China," 142.

widespread Chinese concern that the dharma was in decline. This fear was intimately bound up with apprehension that Chinese Buddhists did not understand the Buddha's teachings sufficiently well to benefit from them and thus were already suffering the effects of this decline. Guanding, in identifying Zhiyi as precisely the person who had understood the Buddha's teachings and formulated them for a Chinese audience, was likely responding to these worries.[113] It is more difficult to perceive these issues at work in the brief passage by Dharma Master Shi, but it is true that many Chinese Buddhists perceived the profusion of different schools of textual interpretation and the competition as clear signs of the decline.[114]

Because the narrative of decline creates a fear of no legitimate authority or capacity for practice, it often appears hand-in-hand with an assertion of authority and the establishment of orthodoxy. Jamie Hubbard, in his work on the much-suppressed Sanjie 三階 movement founded by Xinxing 信行 (540–594), argues convincingly that those speaking the rhetoric of decline are "more interested in establishing a particular orthodoxy of 'true teaching' than in voicing historical predictions of actual decline, prophetic warnings of moral failings, or existential statements about humankind's capacity for realization.[115] I would add that whether the rhetoric of decline is accepted or rejected, it requires a response and suggest that despite the obvious differences between Sanjie, Sanlun, and early Tiantai doctrines and communities, we consider Dharma Master Shi and Guanding's claims on behalf of their traditions in this light.[116] As Hubbard writes, "[C]onservative attempts to secure an orthodoxy…subsequently generated an entire narrative tradition replete with numerous tropes that in turn func-

[113] On this issue, Penkower refers to a shift from viewing Buddhism through *xuanxue* 玄學 to approaching it though exegetical literature ("In the Beginning," 251). As she points out, a number of the figures in the lineage are the authors of such works.

[114] Wendi Adamek writes, "One of the most frequently cited signs of the final age of the Dharma was the multiplication of false teachings and corrupt monks, and many clerics attempted to formulate means to guarantee that a pure Dharma and Sangha could arise from the mire of lavish donation and elite patronage" (*The Mystique of Transmission*, 157).

[115] *Absolute Delusion, Perfect Buddhahood*, 35.

[116] In his review of Hubbard's book, Alan Cole asked if Xinxing had justified his position in terms of lineage. When I asked Hubbard this question directly, he replied that the construction of lineage seems not to have been an issue for Xinxing (personal communication, June 19, 2003). Adamek notes a later use of Xinxing's name in a esoteric lineage (*The Mystique of Transmission*, 105).

tioned in China, ironically, as doors of interpretive opportunity, allowing or even demanding new doctrine, or at least new interpretations of doctrine."[117]

Decline, Texts, and Meditation

Barrett connects the decline of the dharma and lineage specifically in relation to Chan Buddhism and with attention to historical circumstances. He writes, "In the seventh century…, I for one would see the overall backdrop of the Zen quest for an undeniable access to enlightenment, a shining transmission of the lamp amidst the encircling gloom, as being constituted by the staggering catastrophes of the sixth century, from the bloody fall of the Liang to the outright persecution of the Northern Zhou."[118] As will be evident when we address Chan in the following chapter, I find his observations compelling but would argue that they are also applicable to early Sanlun and Tiantai moves toward the use of lineage. For now, it is helpful to clarify one of Barrett's points. He argues that before the eighth century, the emphasis was on the transmission of texts as opposed to the transmission of authority from person to person and that the success of Xuanzang 玄奘 (600–664) in bringing back from India so many previously unknown texts as well as a new interpretive framework for them, far from resolving Chinese Buddhist doubts, created a new awareness of the fallibility of texts. When Xuanzang returned in 645 to great acclaim and spent the rest of his life translating and correcting the errors of his fellow Chinese Buddhists, Barrett argues, he actually had the effect of discouraging and unsettling his fellow Chinese Buddhists. Such contact with India imported new disputes and provided additional evidence of a general decline in Buddhism. In response, some Chinese Buddhists looked elsewhere not for the

---

117 *Absolute Delusion*, 37. See also the comments of Alan Cole, *Fathering Your Father*, chap. 2.

118 Review of *Seeing through Zen: Encounter, Transformation, and Genealogy in Chinese Chan Buddhism* by John R. McRae, 423. He has also discussed this issue in "Kill the Patriarchs!" and his arguments about Xuanzang are amplified in "Exploratory Observations on Some Weeping Pilgrims," 99–110. Barrett credits McRae with "perceptively not[ing] that both the mo-fa doctrine *and* the notion of a succession originally applied to Kashmir or other regions outside China, but both were taken up by the Chinese as if addressed specifically to them" and adds "I would further argue that the two ideas are linked" ("Kill the Patriarchs" 95 n. 48).

text that would be the key but for authoritative and effective practices and teachers (which also generate texts.) As Barrett puts it, the "best alternative...was to assert boldly that the lamp of the dharma blazed on, as it had in the uncomprehending dark even before Hsuan-tsang had felt moved to go to India."[119]

It is evident that the Sanlun figures Jizang and Dharma Master Shi were primarily concerned with texts and their proper interpretation; when they introduce the notion of a transmission from person to person, it is in service of this. But what of Guanding? Was he concerned with the transmission of texts? Some scholars have seen in Guanding's presentation of Zhiyi's lineage an Indian line associated with learning, or *jiao* 教, balanced against a Chinese line associated with meditation, or *guan* 觀.[120] So why is Tiantai so strongly associated with textual transmission?

In an analysis that complicates Barrett's assertion, Penkower argues that Guanding intended to illustrate with the Indian and Chinese lines of transmission the necessary balance between learning and meditation, whereas the later Tiantai figure Zhanran 湛然 (711–782) came to understand both lines of transmission as textual. In a twist on Barrett's scenario of decline-inspired rejection of texts, Zhanran seems to have regarded textual transmission as more secure than transmission from individual to individual.[121]

Mid-Tang Transmission Stories: Sanlun and Faxiang

Guanding's creation of a lineage for Zhiyi may have influenced other groups to develop or construct transmission histories of their own, but, as we will see, they did not necessarily use the same sources or conceive of transmission similarly. Consider the comments of one Junzheng 均正, whom Tang Yongtong has identified as Huijun 慧均, a contemporary of Jizang who also belonged to the 'Sanlun transmission.'[122] In the *Dacheng silun xuanyi* 大乘四論玄義, written around

[119] "Kill the Patriarchs!" 97.
[120] See Penkower, "In the Beginning," 260 and Daniel Stevenson, *The Great Calming and Contemplation*, 34–40.
[121] "Making and Remaking Tradition," 1335 (4), 1331(8), 1325–1307 (14–32).
[122] Tang, "Zhongguo Fojiao zongpai wenti bulun," 367–8. Tang explains that Huijun held the title *sengzheng* and therefore his name may have been shortened to Junzheng.

658, he presents a question from a Chengshi advocate and answers it from a Sanlun perspective:

> Question: "The ten houses quote sūtras, and you also base yourself on sūtras. How is it that you alone are right and they are wrong?"
>
> Reply: "This matter is like [a man's] two sons by a wife and a maidservant fighting over property. How can [the sons] be the same? This house [i.e., Sanlun] has received the style of Nāgārjuna, who studied Mahāyāna in south India. The others rely on the treatise of Harivarman who studied Hīnayāna in Kashmir [and authored the *Chengshi lun*]. [To think that those who] study the two Di[lun]-She[lun] śāstras have obtained the master-lineage of the Mahāyāna is already deficient. You study Cheng[shi], vinaya, and the Di-She śāstras; our house studies the three treatises. The beginning of our *Dvādaśamukha-śāstra* says 'Now we will summarize and explain the Mahāyāna." The *Madhyamaka-śāstra* also says in the beginning, 'as it says in the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā*." The beginning of your [Chengshi] śāstra says, "Why create this śāstra? I desired to prove the true meaning of the three baskets.' "[123]

Huijun here judges the texts upon which the different schools base themselves not only on their content but on the background of their authors, the base for judgment being a hierarchy of Mahāyāna over Hīnayāna. What is interesting here, as Tang has noted, is the reference to property as a reflection of the struggle over property inheritance. Huijun labels his own school as the son of the wife, i.e., the legitimate heir, and regards the others as the offspring of mere servants. Also worth noting is that Huijun has not picked up on Dharma Master Shi's theory of Kumārajīva in the succession.

At some point after 659, just a few years after Huijun wrote the above, Kuiji 窺基 (632–82) made the first known statements on succession for the tradition known as Weishi 唯識 or Faxiang 法相 and associated with the pilgrim and translator Xuanzang and the Indian master Dharmapāla (530–561). At the outset of his *Chengweishi lun shuyao* 成唯識論樞要, Kuiji narrates what Dan Lusthaus calls the "transmission of Buddhism."[124] This is a list of Indian Buddhist luminaries apparently central to Kuiji's creative understanding of Weishi tradition. Lusthaus argues that Xuanzang "rather than feeling himself to be part of a distinct lineage from Dharmapāla…thought of himself

---

[123] XZJ v. 74.47b1–7. The first two quotations correspond to the Taishō texts; the third takes some liberties by interpolating a question not found in the *Chengshi lun*.

[124] *Buddhist Phenomenology*, 387. The passage, which Lusthaus summarizes in part and translates in part (387–91), is T.43.1831.607c26–608c22.

as an inheritor of the grand, accumulated prestige of Nālandā as a whole."[125] Kuiji makes no reference to the tradition of the five masters of the dharma; Mahākāśyapa does not even get a mention. The first several figures are called bodhisattvas and described in order, but there is no attempt to connect them, no discussion of transmission at all, much less the language familiar from earlier sources and claims, like 'transmit' (*fu* 付), 'hand down' (*chuan* 傳), and 'entrust' (*zhu* 屬). The transmission, if it is one, is of a different nature than that found in earlier Sanlun or Tiantai sources. Nor is it the general transmission found in the tradition of the masters of dharma; it is far more specific as to the particular ideas and texts which contain the essence of the teaching. Also significant is that only two of the figures identified by Kuiji appear in the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*. All this suggests that he was devising or compiling on his own, either unaware of or deliberately rejecting the sources his rivals were using.

Next comes a curious story of the monk-scholar Dharmapāla instructing a patron of his. Dharmapāla anticipates his death and tells this layman, who has a talent for judging the spiritual gifts of others, to watch the crowds who will undoubtedly visit in the wake of his death for someone able to understand the commentary Dharmapāla has written on Vasubandhu's *Triṃśikā*. That person turned out to be the Kuiji's master, the Chinese pilgrim Xuanzang who, according to Kuiji, immediately recognized this text as a treasure. As Lusthaus notes, in an odd discontinuity in the account, when Xuanzang returns to China and sets to work translating the ten commentaries on the *Triṃśikā*, it is Kuiji, not Xuanzang, who insists that Dharmapāla's commentary is the best and must be used as the basis for a new text that will combine all ten of the commentaries.[126]

The reason Kuiji gives for his insistence resonates with the earlier discussion of the decline of the dharma, though he does not use the term. He simply states his concern that since the authors of the commentaries are all famous and respected Indian monks, the discrepancies between the commentaries will give rise to confusion and a sort of relativism in which the superiority of Dharmapāla's commentary is overlooked.

While Lusthaus identifies Kuiji's account as a transmission and speculates about its place in the rise of lineage in Chinese Buddhism,

---

[125] Lusthaus, *Buddhist Phenomenology*, 396.
[126] *Buddhist Phenomenology*, 394–7.

it is strikingly different from previous attempts to connect to India. Rather than draw on the tradition of the masters of the dharma, it lists Nāgārjuna and then a number of Yogācāra authors (whose lifetimes did not overlap, in most cases) before narrating the transmission of Dharmapāla's commentary from Dharmapāla to his lay student to Xuanzang and then to Kuiji himself. Until we arrive at Dharmapāla, there is no description of transmission; with Dharmapāla, it is clear that the transmission is of a text to a person capable of fathoming its depths.[127]

This transmission account also stands out from those preceding it in the prominent, indeed culminating, role taken by the author Kuiji. None of the accounts considered up to this point name the author as a recipient of the transmission, much less lavish attention on him. Jizang, for example, while claiming to be an heir, if not the heir, to the Sanlun transmission, does not describe the transmission in detail. When we consider, however, the doctrinal dispute that broke out between Kuiji and another of Xuanzang's students, Wonch'uk 圓測 (613–696), the clarity of the transmission in this case makes a great deal of sense. Given this dispute, with an accompanying (or precipitating) power struggle in which Kuiji and Wonch'uk each became abbot of a monastery at which Xuanzang had worked, was exacerbated by the state not acclaiming Kuiji as Xuanzang's successor or offering patronage as it had to Xuanzang, Kuiji's efforts to justify himself through a transmission theory can hardly be surprising.[128] He provides us with an example of an individual inventing a tradition to support himself as successor to his famous master. Most interesting is that in the process, he represents his master's actions and doctrines in ways uncorroborated and even contradicted by other sources.

Lusthaus, defining lineage as "tracing the transmission of a school's authority through a sequence of masters to its alleged 'root' or

[127] Like the Sanlun transmission accounts discussed about, this is decidedly a transmission based on mastery of texts and there is no mention of meditation or any other practice. However, a new element, that of secrecy, appears in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* biography of Xuanzang. In it, Xuanzang teach Kuiji privately about the *Cheng weishi lun* (T.50.2060.457c–458a.). As Lusthaus argues, this story reflects the conflict between Kuiji and Wonch'uk, another of Xuanzang's students; according to Daoxuan, Wonch'uk deliberately eavesdropped on Xuanzang and Kuiji and then spoke publicly about what he had heard (*Buddhist Phenomenology*, 385). As we will see in the next chapter, secrecy also figures prominently in Chan transmission accounts.

[128] On the dispute and lack of state support after Xuanzang's death, see Lusthaus, *Buddhist Phenomenology*, 384–6.

'patriarch,'" offers the possibility that Kuiji is "one of the early practitioners of 'lineage construction.'"[129] While Kuiji presents a transmission that does not seem to require personal contact between its members and thus perhaps falls short of lineage, his choice to shore up his position through a theory of transmission confirms that this strategy was spreading throughout the Chinese Buddhist world. Lusthaus suggests that it is 'ironic' that Kuiji would not only engage in lineage-construction since this has been regarded as a trait of the 'sinitic' schools of Buddhism but be an early example of it.[130] As I have demonstrated, however, the tendency to seek authority in this manner begins far earlier than Kuiji. Rather than regard him as an early example, I would take him as proof that this approach was becoming more common.

Conclusion

The emergence of Chan lineage has been thought to coincide with three significant shifts in medieval Chinese Buddhism: a transition from attention to śāstras to sūtras, a change from emphasis on text to emphasis on person, and increasing faith in the authority of Chinese Buddhist leaders.[131] These changes are all shown in the Chan tradition, but it would be incorrect to link the shift in emphasis from śāstra to sūtra too strongly with lineage and the transition from an attention to text to attention to person and the growing confidence in the authority of Chinese Buddhist leaders too strongly with Chan in particular.

Curiously enough, all these early attempts at establishing a reliable and legitimate connection to the wellspring of true Buddhism result in rather creative narratives. Although, as Robert Gimello has suggested, "[t]he teacher-disciple relationship in East Asian Buddhism—especially as cultivated within the sangha—seems often to have functioned as an institutional restraint upon doctrinal and other kinds of religious creativity," lineage, projected into the past, served easily as the material for invention.[132]

---

[129] *Buddhist Phenomenology*, 405.

[130] For later Faxiang interest in patriarchs, see Tanaka, "Relations between the Buddhist Sects in the T'ang Dynasty," 168.

[131] On the first, see Penkower, "Making and Remaking Tradition" for an interesting Tiantai example (1318 (21)).

[132] "Li T'ung-hsüan and the Practical Dimensions of Hua-yen," 379, n. 19.

CHAPTER TWO

THE EMERGENCE OF CHAN LINEAGE

Introduction

The development of the Chan tradition, although still far from fully understood, has been researched and interpreted by many scholars. For our purposes, we will consider this history with attention to what is most pertinent for understanding Chan notions of lineage. Chan lineage claims appear with increasing frequency in the late seventh and eighth centuries, and, as scholars have come to realize, they are central to the growth of Chan as a self-conscious tradition. Indeed, lineage is far more crucial for Chan than for any of the traditions discussed in the last chapter. Tiantai begins with the major figure of Zhiyi, and it was his combination of doctrinal and meditational system-building and success in seeking patronage that led his disciples to carry on as a more or less distinct and self-conscious group within Chinese Buddhism. Chan, on the other hand, begins with a series of far less prominent figures laying claim to the legacy of Bodhidharma, a relatively obscure Indian monk. This heavy reliance for authority on a past figure and a succession of heirs came to be joined to a rejection of the traditional textual sources of authority. As Robert Sharf has written, lineage may be viewed "as an ideological tool wielded in the interests of a new Buddhist hermeneutic—the sudden teaching, mind-to-mind transmission, and so on—that was both controversial and potentially destabilizing."[1]

But lineage was more than a mere device. It changed Chinese Buddhism profoundly. Lineage justified new Chan teachings on the nature of awakening and how to attain it. As McRae aptly puts it, it is "not only the Chan school's self-understanding of its own religious history, but the religious practice of Chan itself that is fundamentally genealogical."[2] Chan ideas and practices, deeply intertwined with notions of lineage, became very influential well beyond Chan circles.

---

[1] *Coming to Terms with Chinese Buddhism*, 41.
[2] *Seeing Through Zen*, 8.

With Chan then, lineage moves from a more or less peripheral legitimizing role to that of central substance. In addition, Chan interest in lineage eventually led to an increase in sectarian affiliation in Chinese Buddhism, which persisted until, by the late Song, nearly every elite monk seems to claim a lineage affiliation of some sort.

Scholars have examined the slow and piecemeal creation of a Chan patriarchal list in order to untangle the complex lines of influence and sectarian rivalry that dominate the earliest stages of Chan development. Here we will consider this process of lineage construction for what it reveals about patriarchs, attitudes toward the past, and conceptions of authority. Rather than identify stages of Chan development primarily in terms of doctrine, practice, and institutions, we will trace them in terms of the use of genealogy. Thus the history of the appearance of Chan lineage claims forms our main narrative, though we will also make note of related developments in Tiantai, Daoist, lay Buddhist, and Confucian texts.

Over the course of the seventh through ninth centuries, three important and related changes occurred. First is a shift from the creation of 'the Bodhidharma school' by means of competing lineage claims, varying wildly in detail, to the defense of an increasingly standardized Chan lineage against external critics. Second is a transition from new claims about contemporary or recent figures to the streamlining and bolstering of existing claims about the more distant past. Third is a move from exclusive claims meant to secure authority for one line of descent only to inclusive claims that embrace many lines of descent as legitimate. These three changes, along with the increasing prominence of Chan, contribute to a slowly transforming vision of Chan lineage and its meaning.

The widespread success of the Chan school, including its novel claims about a direct transmission of the dharma from the Buddha to its own masters, should not disguise the fact that, as Bernard Faure writes, "[t]he patriarchal tradition is a product of people on the margins, the result of their desire to become the party of the orthodox."[3] In what follows, we will trace the movement of lineage claims from margin to orthodoxy and observe and analyze changes in the claims themselves.

[3] *The Will to Orthodoxy*, 9.

The First Known Claim of Descent from Bodhidharma: Faru's Epitaph

Almost a century after the death of Zhiyi, an epitaph was written for a monk named Faru 法如 (638–689).[4] In a parallel to the Tiantai case, in which Guanding attempted to construct a lineage for Zhiyi by linking Zhiyi's teacher Huisi to the little-known Huiwen, and through Huiwen to an Indian line of masters, this epitaph links Faru to a little-known figure called Bodhidharma. Faru himself was a long-time disciple of Hongren 弘忍 (601–674), later known as the fifth Chan patriarch and the master of the famous Huineng 慧能 (638–713) of the *Platform Sūtra*. His epitaph constitutes the first known claim of descent from Bodhidharma as well as the first known claim of a silent, wordless transmission. The anonymous author of the epitaph writes of an 'Indian transmission' that occurs without recourse to language.[5] A silent, wordless exchange, marking perfect understanding between two minds, certainly appears in Indian and Chinese Buddhist literature before this, but here it applies to the transmission of the dharma as a whole, not a particular point of understanding.

To support the assertion that there had been a silent transmission in India, the author of the epitaph quotes from Huiyuan's preface to the *Meditation Sūtra* a passage in which Ānanda is described as concealing teachings in his mind and as transmitting the dharma to Madhyāntika, who later transmits it to Śāṇakavāsin. Huiyuan seems to be making the point that Ānanda did not teach the unworthy, that he was silent with them, not that he was silent with Madhyāntika. But the author of the epitaph presents the passage as proof of a silent, wordless transmission in India. He also, as Yanagida has emphasized, quotes Huiyuan's preface selectively so that the preface's pessimistic report about the fragmentation of the Buddhist tradition into five divisions—a standard description of the development of schools within Indian Buddhism (and often taken as proof for theories of decline)—becomes a description of a tradition above or outside such divisions.[6]

---

[4] Presaged perhaps in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* entry on Fachong 法冲 (587–665?), T.50.2060.666a–c. See Faure, *The Will to Orthodoxy*, 28, 145–7, and Adamek, *The Mystique of Transmission*, 159–161.

[5] The Chinese reads 天竺相承本無文字. See Yanagida's transcription in *Shoki zenshū shisho no kenkyū*, 487.

[6] *Shoki zenshū*, 37–8.

After using Huiyuan's preface to bolster the idea of a silent transmission, the epitaph proclaims that Bodhidharma "continued this lineage."[7] Bodhidharma, we are told, came to China and transmitted to Huike 慧可, who transmitted to Sengcan 僧璨, who transmitted to Daoxin 道信, who transmitted to Hongren, who transmitted to Faru, the subject of the epitaph. This tale of an Indian line of masters whose final member travels to China and transmits to a Chinese disciple echoes the transmission story told by the Sanlun master Jizang's student, Dharma Master Shi, although Bodhidharma, unlike Kumārajīva, transmits the mysterious object of silent understanding, not exegetical mastery. In stressing an understanding explicitly beyond textual mastery, this account also resembles—and perhaps responds to—Guanding's claim for Zhiyi, although, unlike Guanding's claim, it posits a single unchanging form of transmission, with no gap between India and China. (The smooth, uninterrupted succession of the Chinese line described by the epitaph in fact joins two previously separate lines of masters and disciples, that of Bodhidharma, Huike, and Sengcan, drawn from the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, and that of Daoxin and Hongren, a master and his student who taught at Shuangfeng shan 雙峰山 and Dongshan 東山 in Hubei.)[8]

Much as the writer of Faru's epitaph chooses to present lines of Huiyuan's preface as evidence of a silent transmission rather than a reference to discreet withholding of the highest teaching from the unfit, he elects to overlook Huiyuan's attention to Buddhabhadra. As McRae points out, in Faru's epitaph, the Kashmiri portion of the transmission, so central to Huiyuan's purpose in identifying Buddhabhadra as heir to a great tradition, vanishes from view.[9] (In a later work by the southern school partisan Shenhui 神會 (684–758), Bodhidharma is conflated with one of Buddhabhadra's teachers, Dharmatrāta, thus bringing Buddhabhadra back onto the scene and resolving the inconsistency between Bodhidharma's reportedly southern origins and the northwestern tradition of the five dharma masters.)

---

[7] See Yanagida's transcription in *Shoki zenshū*, 488. The word I translate as 'lineage' is *zong* 宗 and might also be understood as 'principle'; the two meanings may here overlap without conflict.

[8] See McRae, *The Northern School*, 86, and Faure, *The Will to Orthodoxy*, 27. See also Chen Jinhua's forthcoming, *Fame and Obscurity: Formation and Transformation of Legends about the Third Chan Patriarch*, and Alan Cole's emphasis on the greater context for the carving of the stele (*Fathering Your Father*, chap. 3).

[9] *The Northern School*, 86.

Unlike the Tiantai and the Sanlun cases, this first instance of a Chan lineage seems remote from economic pressures.[10] Whereas Guanding most likely employed lineage claims as an additional method of bolstering Zhiyi's authority in the attempt to secure continued patronage for the monasteries Zhiyi founded, the author of Faru's epitaph seems to have been more concerned with establishing Faru as the heir of Hongren and, by implication, Faru's heir or heirs as the proper leadership of the community. In other words, Guanding uses lineage to assert Zhiyi's importance to the outside world, particularly the imperial court, whereas the author of Faru's epitaph aims to stake a claim for a particular student of Hongren within an extended network of communities influenced by Hongren. This is not to say, of course, that Faru's epitaph was not also composed in order to impress potential supporters of his students.

Another striking difference is that, unlike Guanding, who created a lineage for Zhiyi without implying that he himself or anyone else had inherited Zhiyi's mantle of authority, the author of Faru's epitaph, though he does not name Faru's heir, was clearly concerned with the continuation of the line past Hongren to Faru and, by implication, from Faru to his students. That is, Guanding's articulation of Zhiyi's lineage bolsters the institutions Zhiyi founded and does not suggest that Zhiyi's successors were his equals, whereas Faru's epitaph implies that each succeeding man in the lineage carries the full weight of the tradition in his person.

Faru's epitaph seems to have sparked a debate as well as counterclaims, and in resolving these, some figures and groups did turn to imperial power to settle the disputes. As Welter puts it, "What emerged was factional rivalry born of success publically sanctioned by official power."[11] That factional rivalry produced many claims, all laying claim to some form of the powerful concept of which Faru's epitaph is the first expression in the historical record: a silent and uninterrupted transmission of the whole authority of the tradition.

---

[10] See Barrett's comments, "Kill the Patriarchs!" 90. Barrett is responding to Jorgensen, "The Imperial Lineage of Ch'an Buddhism," 99, who cites Richard Robinson and Ren Jiyu.

[11] *Monks, Rulers, and Literati*, 45.

Compounding the Claim: Zhang Yue's Epitaph for Shenxiu and the *Chuan fabao ji*

In a pattern that will reoccur in the development of Chan lineage, the next significant lineage claim takes over much of a previous claim, in this case, Faru's epitaph, but adds another figure. It emphasizes even more the importance of silent transmission from master to disciple.

In 709, the eminent official Zhang Yue 張說 wrote an epitaph for Shenxiu 神秀 (606–706), another disciple of Hongren and the one who succeeded him, in which he identifies Shenxiu as the next patriarch.[12] In the *Chuan fabao ji* 傳法寶紀 [Chronicle of the Transmission of the Dharma Jewel], written between 713–16, Du Fei 杜胐 presents Shenxiu as another of Hongren's heirs, alongside Faru.[13] In reworking the contents of Faru's epitaph, Du quotes a smaller portion of Huiyuan's preface to the *Meditation Sūtra*, just the reference to three of the five traditional masters of the dharma, Ānanda, Madhyāntika, and Śaṇakavāsin. Du leaves out the line about Ānanda's silence, and one wonders if he judged the reading of the preface in Faru's epitaph to be forced and therefore omitted it. Certainly, he did not avoid it out of a desire to avoid the notion of a silent transmission. He notes, for example, that Bodhidharma "ceased the use of words and disassociated himself from the scriptures."[14] In the text as a whole, Du balances a celebration of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and its teaching with an emphasis on the transmission of the "mind-ground" and an avoidance of "complicated explanations."[15]

Du Fei gave equal weight to the silence of the transmission and on the necessity of human, as opposed to textual, contact. He describes Hongren, Faru, and Shenxiu as very popular teachers, surrounded by masses of students, who nevertheless reserved the highest teaching for the worthy: "If a student were not fit [for enlightenment], he would

---

[12] See Welter, *Monks, Rulers, and Literati*, 31, for a convenient table of early lineage claims, as well as information on claims made for Yifu and Jingxian.

[13] Title as translated by Faure, *The Will to Orthodoxy*, 2.

[14] McRae, *The Northern School*, 267. McRae translates the *Chuan fabao ji* in *The Northern School*, 255–69.

[15] McRae's translation, *The Northern School*, 256, 257. Faure argues that the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* was first associated with the Dongshan school of Daoxin and Hongren in the time of Hongren's student Faru and his disciples (*The Will to Orthodoxy*, 153–6). See also Welter, *Monks, Rulers, and Literati*, 47–9.

[simply] never perceive the ultimate truth [of the teachings]."[16] Du here describes those to whom Hongren, Faru, and Shenxiu did not transmit the dharma with the same expression, *qiren* 其人, that Huiyuan had used to designate those from whom Ānanda concealed the truth. If students are unable to grasp the truth even in the presence of the master, how less likely is it that any will succeed without a master? In insisting on the importance of a teacher, Du offers an analogy to Daoist alchemy, in which "one must obtain the personal instruction of an immortal in order to create cinnabar. Although one may be able to ascend heaven in broad daylight [by this method], if one relies on the blue words of jade-[encrusted] books, it will ultimately come to naught."[17]

The Place of a Text: The *Lengqie shizi ji*

Jingjue 淨覺 (683–c.750) wrote the *Lengqie shizi ji* 楞伽師資記 [Record of the Masters and Disciples of the *Laṅkā[vatāra]*], most likely between 712 and 716.[18] He seems to have composed it without any awareness of the *Chronicle of the Transmission of the Dharma Jewel* and, perhaps as a consequence, offers a strikingly alternative lineage. Jingjue also articulates a variety of views on key issues, particularly the status of texts, study, and language in relation to silent transmission.

Like Du Fei, Jingjue displays devotion to the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*. As the title suggests, however, the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* figures far more significantly in this text as the emblem and object of the transmission than as an object of study. Faure has suggested that this attention to the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* should be understood not in terms of the doctrinal content of the scripture but as an example of the magical potency often attributed to texts, and Welter argues that it "serves as the text that allows Chan practitioners to transcend textual limitations."[19]

---

[16] McRae, *The Northern School*, 268. In Yanagida's annotated presentation of the original, *Shoki no zenshi I* (Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1971), 420.

[17] Slight modification of McRae's translation, *The Northern School*, 257.

[18] Title as translated by Faure, *The Will to Orthodoxy*, 2. On the date of the *Lengqie shizi ji*, see T.H. Barrett's argument for the dates given above in "The Date of the Leng-chia shih-tzu chih" (sic), 255–9. Faure has accepted Barrett's argument, *The Will to Orthodoxy*, 233, n.37.

[19] *The Will to Orthodoxy*, 137, 140–1, and *Monks, Rulers, and Literati*, 48. Buswell argues for a limited and possibly second-hand influence by the sūtra on early Chan thought (*The Formation of Ch'an Ideology in China and Korea*, 148–9).

Unlike Du Fei, Jingjue does not quote Huiyuan's preface or concern himself with India. He begins instead on Chinese soil with the Indian Guṇabhadra (394–468), the translator of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*.[20] He designates Guṇabhadra as "the first" in the transmission of the Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra and then gives the now standard list of the first five patriarchs in China: Bodhidharma, Huike, Sengcan, Daoxin, and Hongren. After Hongren, Jingjue names three men: Shenxiu, Jingjue's own teacher Xuanze 玄賾, and [Laoan/Hui]an 老安/慧安. Without question, Shenxiu is first among equals. The material that follows concerns him alone, and the next generation consists of four of his disciples, the first of whom is Puji 普寂 (651–739). In addition to these thirteen figures, Jingjue mentions quite a few others. He concludes, "From trepiṭaka master Guṇabhadra of the Song [420–479], the lamp has been transmitted down through the ages to the Tang in eight generations. Twenty-four men have attained the way and obtained the fruit."[21]

Although Jingjue names out a single master for the first six generations and a *primes inter pares* for the last two generations, it is clear that he also considers the others, even those he judges to be teachers of merely local importance, to have achieved the same religious goal.[22] As he says of his own teacher Xuanze, "In appearance he was like an ordinary monk, but in his realization he shared the stage of the buddhas."[23] References to the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* do not mean that these men were exegetes. Neither are they described as ascetics or miracle-workers. They are instead exemplars of understanding and awakening. They participate in a special and possibly fragile transmission of truth. Jingjue writes in his entry on Guṇabhadra, "In our land we have the correct Teaching, but it is secret and not openly transmitted…If not for encounters with good and wise teachers, there would be no transmission from 'father' to 'son.'"[24]

---

[20] See Faure, *The Will to Orthodoxy*, 156–7, on the probability that Jingjue was not the first to place Guṇabhadra in the lineage.

[21] See Yanagida, *Shoki no zenshi I*, 321. It reads 起自宋求那跋陀羅三藏。歷代傳燈。至于唐朝総嘗八代。得道獲果。有二十四人也。T.85.2837.1290c25–6 leaves out one unimportant phrase.

[22] See Welter's comments, *Monks, Rulers, and Literati*, 50.

[23] As translated by J.C. Cleary in *Zen Dawn: Early Zen Texts from Tun Huang*, 19. McRae reviewed this book with a focus on Cleary's translation of the *Lengqie shizi ji*. For the original, see Yanagida, *Shoki no zenshi I*, 57.

[24] *Zen Dawn*, 26. For the original, see Yanagida, *Shoki no zenshi I*, 93. It reads 我中國有正法，秘不傳…若不逢良賢，父子不傳。This statement is also interesting

McRae has described the *Record of the Masters and Disciples of the Laṅkā[vatāra]* as 'matter-of-fact' in its treatment of transmission, focused instead on issues of doctrine.[25] I would add that, although the generations are laid out and disciples named, there is a striking lack of attention to the specific moments of transmission that later become so important to the Chan tradition. Guṇabhadra and Bodhidharma are never even said to have met. Many other pairs of masters and disciples are, but in general we are told how many years they spent together, as opposed to how or when a single event of transmission happened.

Jingjue's presentation of these figures resembles Guanding's characterization of Zhiyi in that individual religious understanding is stressed without a rejection of texts per se. Indeed, the *Record of the Masters and Disciples of the Laṅkā[vatāra]* echoes Zhiyi's concern about the favoring of study over practice or vice versa.[26] This moderate attitude may help us understand the identification of Guṇabhadra as a patriarch, which would appear to fly in the face of Weinstein's argument that translators are not included in the lineages of the Tang schools. Weinstein asserts that this because of a general shift from close analysis of Indian treatises before the Tang to free-wheeling Chinese interpretation of scriptures in the Tang.[27] Faure, however, points out that Jingjue's teacher, Xuanze, who had perhaps helped the famous pilgrim and scholar Xuanzang 玄奘 in his translation work, almost certainly regarded study as a necessary element of the path.[28] At any rate, this is Guṇabhadra's only known appearance in a lineage. (And, as has been often noted, the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* soon fell from favor in the developing Chan school, eclipsed by the *Diamond Sūtra*, which in time, as rhetoric against texts reached a crescendo, also lost its central position.)

Jingjue begins the *Record of the Masters and Disciples of the Laṅkā[vatāra]* with a verse with a clear rejection of language as a conveyor of truth. It reads, in part:

---

for two additional reasons. First, it raises the issue of secrecy, which will figure in later Chan attempts to come to terms with the lack of corroboration of a transmission. Second, it uses familial language.

[25] *The Northern School*, 88.

[26] Faure, *The Will to Orthodoxy*, 49–50.

[27] "Imperial Patronage in T'ang Buddhism," 272–3.

[28] *The Will to Orthodoxy*, 158–9.

> All recourse to the written word or oral tradition betrays a false conception of Chan. The Dharma [which was preached at the time] of the Nirvāṇa remains a secret that could not be taught to others. It is communicated through the mind and always works in silence.[29]

Nevertheless, Jingjue expresses his approval of two treatises attributed to Bodhidharma (while rejecting a third); Faure sees in this an attitude neither of complete rejection of texts nor of narrow devotion to textual study.[30] A less vehement attitude toward language appears in the entry on Daoxin, who states:

> The secret essence of this Dharma cannot be transmitted to the wrong person. It is not that we are reluctant to pass it on; it is that we fear that people will not believe and will fall into the crime of slandering the Dharma. Take care! Take care! Though the Dharma sea is immeasurable, it is traveled in a single word. When you find the meaning you forget the word. Not using even a single word, yet knowing with complete comprehension like this—this is getting the Buddha's meaning.[31]

Here, much like Ānanda in Huiyuan's preface to the *Meditation Sūtra*, Daoxin seems to advise refraining from language in part to avoid transmission to the 'wrong people,' who cannot understand or accept the full truth and in doubting it may do themselves harm. Relying on a silent transmission, in which the transmitter does not speak a word and the recipient understands silently—and, it is assumed, perfectly—is more secure.

Puji's Hall of Patriarchs and Shenhui's Attack

The next important event in the development of Chan lineage takes the form of a building, rather than a text, and the controversy surrounding it focuses on the paramount question of whether or not the transmission is limited to a single heir. We have no direct evidence about this building itself. We know only that, according to the *Putidamo nanzong ding shifei lun* 菩提達摩南宗定是非論 [Treatise Establishing the True and the False] compiled by Dugu Pei 獨孤沛, in 732 a monk

---

[29] As translated by Faure, *The Will to Orthodoxy*, 140. The original appears in Yanagida, *Shoki no zenshi II*, 49.

[30] *The Will to Orthodoxy*, 165.

[31] *Zen Dawn*, 61. The original appears in Yanagida, *Shoki no zenshi II*, 241. The expression *qiren* appears again.

named Shenhui 神會 accused Puji, Shenxiu's most prominent disciple, of setting up a "hall of seven patriarchs" 七祖堂 on Songshan 嵩山 near Luoyang.[32] Shenhui's tirade against Puji's hall specifies two problems with this hall, one to do with content and another with principle. First, the hall does not identify Hongren's heir as Huineng, whom Shenhui claimed as his teacher. Second, it names two heirs, Faru and Shenxiu, and Shenhui rejects the very possibility of a patriarch having more than one heir.[33]

---

[32] See Welter, *Monks, Rulers, and Literati*, 31–3, for a summary of the conflict and its political context. The text appears in T.85, Annex, and also in *Shenhui heshang yiji*, ed. Hu Shi. The translation is that of Faure, *The Will to Orthodoxy*, 89. Yampolsky understood this as the hall of the seventh patriarch (*Platform Sūtra*, 28), but Foulk and Sharf argue that it should be read as the hall of the seven patriarch*s* ("On the Ritual Use of Ch'an Portraiture in Medieval China," 172, n.45).

After Puji's death, an unknown author composed an epitaph with an intriguing allusion to his place in the transmission:

> Only Heaven is great, and only Yao followed it.
> Only the Buddha is saintly, and only [Bodhidharma] has inherited from him.
> This is why, in the Indian transmission, five suns brighten antiquity, whereas in the Chinese transmission, seven patriarchs have shed light on imperial fates.
> Our seventh patriarch is the master Dazhao, Preceptor of State under three reigns.
> Having transcended the two extremes, he passed through the stages of the career of the Bodhisattva,
> acquired the compassion of the Tathāgatha, and achieved the cognitive vision of the Buddha.
> (Faure, *The Will to Orthodoxy*, 97)

The original text appears in Tanaka Ryōshō, *Tonkōzenshū bunken no kenkyū*, 555. McRae also translates this passage, and where Faure inserts 'Bodhidharma,' McRae follows Tanaka in reading 'Chan' (*The Northern School*, 65). Scholars have looked to this passage as proof that Puji was considered the seventh patriarch by his followers and, indeed, a Buddha. I would point out the reference to "five suns" in the Indian transmission. Could this be an allusion to the five masters of the dharma? If it is, it is the first such reference in Chan lineage claims. Huiyuan's *Mediation Sūtra* preface mentions only four of the five, although the *Meditation Sūtra* itself lists all five, and Faru's epitaph and the *Chuan fabao ji* refer only to three. This wisp of evidence cannot bear much weight, but it does suggest that the store of 'information' available to Chan genealogists was expanding.

[33] See *Dingshifei lun* in *Shenhui heshang yiji*, 288–90, 348–50. Note that the invented and therefore ideal transmission of one master per generation, which begins with Shenhui, if not earlier, is immediately disrupted by the shift from mythical past to historical reality. That is, as soon as the idea of the transmission enters the present or recent past, multiple contestants appear and compete for the position. In some cases, only one is accepted, but more often the master is allowed to have made multiple transmissions. Whether these students are themselves admitted to produce heirs is the next question. On the question of who first argued that one person per generation received the transmission, see Jorgensen, who credits Shenhui ("The Imperial Lineage," 90), and Foulk and Sharf, who suggest that it may have begun with Faru and his circle ("On the Ritual Use of Ch'an Portraiture," 174, n. 48).

In his attack on those who claimed transmission from Hongren through masters other than Huineng (and who taught a method of "gradual" enlightenment), Shenhui introduced a new element to the transmission: the patriarchal robe. This material symbol of transmission could, of course, only be passed to a single heir and therefore bolstered Shenhui's theory of single transmission.[34] Others have examined fruitfully the symbolism and vicissitudes of Bodhidharma's robe;[35] I mention it here only to note that Shenhui chooses to have a physical object act as proof of a wordless transmission.

Shenhui focused his efforts on establishing his teacher Huineng as the sixth patriarch, but he also presented a version of the Indian segment of the lineage. Shenhui explains:

> Bodhidharma received the teaching from Saṅgharakśa, Saṅgharakśa received it from Śubhamitra, Śubhamitra received it from Upagupta, Upagupta received it from Śāṇavāsa, Śāṇavāsa received it from Madhyāntika, Madhyāntika from Ānanda, Ānanda from Kāśyapa, Kāśyapa from the Tathāgata. When we come to China, Bodhidharma is considered the Eighth Patriarch. In India, Prajñāmitra received the Law from Bodhidharma. In China it was Hui-k'o ch'an-shih who came after Bodhidharma. Since the time of the Tathāgata there were, in all, in India and China, some thirteen Patriarchs.[36]

---

[34] Faure observes that "the two basic arguments underlying Shenhui's patriarchal theory—the principle of a single filiation and the Dharma transmission symbolized and authenticated by possession of the patriarchal robe—were abandoned as soon as their goal, that of eliminating the Northern School, had been achieved" (*The Will to Orthodoxy*, 100). Peter Gregory notes, "In the late eighth and early ninth centuries, there were no fixed ceremonies according to which a disciple's understanding was sanctioned by his master, thereby authorizing him to carry on his master's tradition" (*Tsung-mi and the Sinification of Buddhism*, 50–1.) He adds, "The artificiality of the story of the transmission of the patriarchal robe begun by Shen-hui and repeated in the *Record of the Masters and Disciples of the Laṅkā[vatāra]* and *Platform Sūtra* underlines the fact that there was no commonly accepted procedure for transmitting the dharma" (51, n. 82).

[35] See Anna K. Seidel, "Den'e," *Hōbōgirin*, v. 8, 1171–8 ; Faure, "Quand l'habit fait le moine: the symbolism of the kāṣāya in Sōtō Buddhism"; Koichi Shinohara, "The Kāṣāya Robe of the Past Buddha Kaśyapa in the Miraculous Instruction Given to Vinaya Master Daoxuan (596–667)"; Adamek, "Robes Purple and Gold: Transmission of the Robe in the *Lidai fabao ji* (Record of the Dharma-Jewel Through the Ages)" and *The Mystique of Transmission*, esp. chap. 5.

[36] See *Putidamo nanzong ding shifei lun* in *Shenhui heshang yiji*, ed. Hu Shi, 294, trans. Yampolsky, *The Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch*, 29–30. As Yampolsky points out, Shenhui says he is drawing on a preface to the *Meditation Sūtra*, most likely Huiyuan's, but Huiyuan's list omits Kāśyapa, and Shenhui's list includes him, suggesting that Shenhui drew on the text of the *Meditation Sūtra* itself. (The only inconsistency in this borrowing is that where Shenhui would have been expected to

Although Shenhui's grand total of thirteen patriarchs does not include this figure, Shenhui gives Bodhidharma an Indian heir as well as a Chinese heir.[37] Yampolsky speculates that the name of this Indian heir, Prajñāmitra, is a mistake for 'Puṇyamitra,' a name found in the *Meditation Sūtra* after that of Dharmatrāta.[38] Presumably, in this way, Shenhui accounts for the fact that Dharmatrāta is not the last name on the list, an inconsistency which did not go unnoticed by later critics. In a jab against his fellow Chan monks, Shenhui also explains that Bodhidharma's Indian heir did not inherit a robe; it was unnecessary since none in India were so false as to claim transmission without justification.[39]

In his scheme of thirteen patriarchs, Shenhui places the three figures in Huiyuan's preface back into the tradition of the five masters of the dharma. More significantly, he also conflates Bodhidharma, a royal scion of southern India, with Dharmatrāta, a Sarvāstivādin teacher in Kashmir.[40] Aside from this crucial innovation, however, Shenhui's scheme of thirteen patriarchs did not meet with success. We know of only one later adoption of the idea, and scholars have assumed that later Chan historians found the notion of a mere thirteen patriarchs spanning the several centuries from the lifetime of the Buddha to that of Bodhidharma less than credible.[41]

Around 752, almost twenty years after his condemnation of Puji's hall of patriarchs, Shenhui himself erected a hall of patriarchs in which

---

give the name Vasumitra from the *Meditation Sūtra*, he instead offers Śubhamitra.) Although Huiguan also omits Kāśyapa, it is unlikely that Shenhui was referring to his preface since Huiyuan's preface circulated more widely attached to the text and the title of Huiguan's preface does not lend itself to being abbreviated to "preface to the *Meditation Sūtra*." Yampolsky mentions only the absence of Kāśyapa from Huiyuan's preface, not the absence of the last figures as well. This discrepancy in sources helps explain a point made by Yanagida about Shenhui using the preface to the *Meditation Sūtra* differently than did the author of Faru's epitaph. Whereas the latter simply quoted a passage, Shenhui plucks out all the names and arranges them in his own words (*Shoki zenshū*, 124). It is clear now that while Shenhui did glean the names himself and present them in his own narrative, he was also drawing on a different source, i.e., the *Meditation Sūtra* itself, not Huiyuan's preface.

[37] See *Putidamo nanzong ding shifei lun* in *Shenhui heshang yiji*, ed. Hu Shi, 295.

[38] *The Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch*, 29, n. 92.

[39] See *Putidamo nanzong ding shifei lun* in *Shenhui heshang yiji*, ed. Hu Shi, 296. See also Adamek, *The Mystique of Transmission*, 157.

[40] On this, see Paul Demiéville, "Appendice sur 'Damoduoluo' (Dharmatrāta)," 46–7, and Yanagida, *Shoki zenshū*, 307f.

[41] For the single case of a later use, see Yampolsky, *Platform Sūtra*, 30, n. 95, on Fang Guan's (697–793) inscription for Sengcan.

his teacher Huineng occupied the place of sixth patriarch. Jorgensen has argued that such halls of patriarchs were based on the model of imperial ancestral halls, complete with portraits, and thus mark an important milestone in the absorption of specifically Confucian and familial language and forms into Chan notions of lineage.[42]

If Shenhui was in fact appealing to the court and the logic of imperial succession, his position in relation to the court in some ways recalls that of Guanding, and his intended audience differs significantly from that for earlier Chan lineage claims, like those in Faru's epitaph, i.e., the various groups claiming descent from Bodhidharma. Shenhui's rivalry with the disciples of Shenxiu no doubt provoked his insistence that only one disciple receives the transmission in each generation. Whether or not he was consciously trying to emulate or evoke imperial succession, Shenhui surely wanted to concentrate religious authority in one person per generation. The dharma heir becomes the master, just as the heir apparent to the throne becomes the emperor. Master and disciple are, on one level, identical.[43] The assertion that this one-to-one transmission has been passed on, without interruption, since the time of the Buddha heightens the sense that master and heir are substantially identical.

The idea of a complete, direct, and uninterrupted transmission is suggested in Faru's epitaph, but Shenhui is the first to emphasize it by naming all those who have received the transmission. Stevenson and Penkower have argued that Guanding and the later Tiantai tradition found the joining of the Indian and Chinese lines and, indeed, the gap between them religiously significant, representative of both transmission and real discontinuity.[44] Is Shenhui's vision of Chan lineage similarly significant? It is tempting to see Shenhui as self-promoting and his advocacy of a single, direct transmission as self-serving, but, as McRae reminds us, we cannot recover his intent or fully understand

---

[42] Jorgensen, "The Imperial Lineage of Ch'an Buddhism," 122. See also Alan Cole, "Upside Down/Right Side Up: A Revisionist History of Buddhist Funerals in China," 329–30. This new overlay of Chinese familial ritual on Chan figures also appears in the behavior of one of Puji's lay followers, a rather important official named Pei Kuan 裴寬 (d. 755), who took part in Puji's funeral procession barefoot and dressed in mourning clothes, as though mourning a father (McRae, *The Northern School*, 67).

[43] See Adamek on mind-to-mind transmission as a "source of identity and violent conflict between master and disciple" ("Issues in Chinese Buddhist Transmission," 247).

[44] Stevenson, *The Great Calming and Contemplation*, 34–41, and Penkower, "In the Beginning," 248–68.

the circumstances.[45] Regardless of origin, the notion of a single one-to-one transmission from master to disciple has exerted a powerful attraction for many who did not stand to gain from it personally.

Tiantai Developments: Familial Language and Zhanran on the Centrality of the Text

As Penkower has noted, Zhiyi's final testament is replete with familial language, and yet the transition from Zhiyi as father figure to Tiantai lineage claims was a slow one, highly influenced by the need for continued patronage.[46] After Guanding's initial efforts, it was not until the mid-Tang, when the communities founded by Zhiyi had lost much of their doctrinal and liturgical cohesion, that lineage came again to the fore. Zhanran 湛然 (711–782), a student of Xuanlang 玄朗 (673–754), raises the issue of lineage for two related reasons. He wants, first, to clarify and adjust Zhiyi's identity and, second, to extend the Tiantai lineage from Zhiyi to the present.

In the process, Zhanran rejects an alternative version of Tiantai lineage, involving six early Chinese meditation masters in addition to Huisi, Huiwen, and Zhiyi.[47] He criticizes as stupid (although superior to the methods of Bodhidharma) the practices associated with Fu Xi 傅翕 (497–569), the only figure of the six who has been identified. He also points out this transmission does not consist of a one-to-one passing-down of the dharma and, for reasons perhaps similar to those of Shenhui, insists that there can be only one patriarch in a generation. He also criticizes his contemporaries for an overemphasis on meditation and the concomitant lack of textual basis. Penkower understands Zhanran's attitude to be both a retort to Chan lineage and an increased emphasis on texts.[48] Stevenson sees in Zhanran's writings on the *Mohe zhiguan* an offensive against a Tiantai tradition of "oral teaching" or "transmission of the essentials of the mind," which, as Stevenson

[45] McRae, *Seeing through Zen*, 107–8. Adamek voices a similar discomfort with the common characterization of Shenhui as, in her words, "a self-aggrandizing opportunist" (*The Mystique of Transmission*, 138).

[46] "In the Beginning," 273–4.

[47] Zhanran does not simply accept Guanding's version of Tiantai transmission. As Penkower has shown, he elaborates on it by naming and bringing together the two transmissions, and then he re-centers it on Huisi, Zhiyi, and the *Lotus Sūtra*, leaving out Huiwen and the *Da zhidu lun* ("Making and Remaking Tradition," 17–9).

[48] "Making and Remaking Tradition," 18–9.

points out, Zhanran does not regard as a matter of Chan influence but as a problematic internal view.[49]

Indirect evidence suggests that Zhanran's teacher Xuanlang himself may very well have claimed the authority of the transmission.[50] If so, Zhanran carried his teacher's agenda forward by incorporating the extended lineage into a larger project of affirming (and redefining) Tiantai identity. As Penkower points out, in Zhanran's treatment of the transmission, he adopts classic familial terms from the Han dictionary, the *Erya* 爾雅, to describe members of the Tiantai transmission.[51] One might be tempted to see influence on Zhanran from Shenhui and his hall of patriarchs, but it seems more likely that in both Chan and Tiantai, once the notion of lineage had appeared and the analogy to family was made, a pool of traditional Chinese familial language was readily available. For example, Penkower argues that in Zhanran's use of familial language he is responding to the encroachment of Chan, Faxiang, and Huayan by laying claim not to a particular tradition within Buddhism but to the entire patrimony (and accompanying authority) of the Buddha.[52] In other words, the resemblance of Zhanran's strategy to that of Shenhui is obvious but not necessarily a matter of influence.

The Popularity of Patriarchs

By the second half of the eighth century, references to a line of seven patriarchs appear in the writings of literati like Du Fu 杜甫 (712–70) and Li Hua 李華 (c. 717–774), attesting to its widespread currency. But the meaning these theories of transmission were intended to convey did not always carry over to lay Buddhists. In Li Hua's epitaph for Xuanlang, probably written not later than 764, for example, Li describes both a multi-branched Chan transmission and the Tiantai lineage to which Xuanlang belonged.[53]

---

[49] *The Great Calming and Contemplation*, 46–8.

[50] Penkower gives as the earliest evidence the claim of a student of Xuanlang's in a 748 preface, i.e., before Xuanlang's death, that Xuanlang revived the transmission of Zhiyi and Guanding ("Making and Remaking Tradition," 7–10). Li Hua's epitaph, which Silvio Vita dates to 764, gives a more elaborate transmission ("Li Hua and Buddhism," 107).

[51] "In the Beginning," 16.

[52] "Making and Remaking Tradition," 12, 16–7.

[53] For the epitaph, *Quan Tang wen* 320.1a–4b, especially 1b–2a.

Li Hua had a strong interest in genealogy, especially that of his own family, the great Zhaojun Li 趙郡李 clan, and of distaff relations and in-laws. His experience in diagramming family relations and narrating family origins may have prompted him to devote particular attention to the details of Buddhist lineage. They may have also influenced him to think in terms of multi-branched family trees.[54] He devotes little attention to the Indian line of Chan transmission, simply mentioning twenty-nine generations after the Buddha "transmits the mind-dharma" to Mahākāśyapa, and then describing Bodhidharma, who "passes on the dharma of the Laṅkā[vatāra]," and four distinct lines, two of which he identifies as the Northern school, one as the Southern school, and one as the Oxhead school. He seems untroubled by the existence of collateral lines and moves without comment from Bodhidharma's heirs to Tiantai lineage, which begins with Huiwen, who "studied the dharma of Nāgārjuna," and concludes with Xuanlang, a fellow recipient of the dharma named Hongjing, and a student of Hongjing.

Li Hua's openness toward multiple branches within a lineage and more than one transmission of the dharma almost certainly derives not only from his interest in genealogy but also from his own position as a lay Buddhist without sectarian leanings. Without a stake in declaring one or another lineage superior, he is instead interested in presenting the details of the many masters he knew and had heard of as members of a large and glorious clan like his own.

A Daoist Lineage

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the mid-second-century figure Zhang Daoling 張道陵 inspired the Tianshi 天師, or Celestial Master movement in Sichuan. He is also the putative founder of a lineage of Celestial Masters that continues to the present day. However, as Barrett reports, up to the mid-eighth century, "[t]he concept of a single line of supreme hierarchs, passing on from generation to generation, is entirely absent."[55] The emphasis in Daoism up to that point seems to have been on the transmission of sacred texts, rituals, and recipes, not on the individuals participating in that transmission. Soon thereafter,

[54] See David Johnson, "The Last Years of a Great Clan: The Li Family of Chao chün in late T'ang and early Sung," 44–7.

[55] "The Emergence of the Taoist Papacy in the T'ang Dynasty," 103.

however, in the mid-Tang, a "multiplication of claims to genealogical or geographical connections with Chang Tao-ling" occurred.[56] The great Daoist Du Guangting 杜光庭 (850–933) wrote, after 905, that a sword would be passed to one member of every generation "whose fitness for the task would be revealed by the presence of several strands of vermilion hair upon his head."[57] Barrett points out that until the claim that the Tang rulers descended from Laozi fell out of favor, there was little reason for Daoists to turn to lineage as a strategy of authority.[58] For our purposes, what is intriguing is the possibility that Shenhui's assertion that only one person in each generation received the transmission and, along with it, a special object may have helped inspire this innovation in Daoism. Especially interesting is the novel idea that the designated heir has on his head several vermilion hairs, a characteristic visible to those who know to seek it and presumably imperceptible to those who do not.

Repeated Patriarchs and a Robe: *The Lidai fabao ji*

Just as the notion of Chan lineage opened the field to competing claims, Shenhui's introduction of a single line of transmission in which the robe as well as the dharma was passed down gave rise to new claims. In a text entitled *Lidai fabao ji* 曆代法寶記 [Record of the Dharma-Jewel Through the Generations], composed around 780, a community in Sichuan led by Wuzhu 無住 (714–774) laid claim to the dharma and robe of Huineng through Wuxiang 無相 (Kor. Musang, 684–762).[59] It is the first account of Chan lineage to present a complete Indian transmission. It did so by drawing on the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, which had already served as a source for Dharma Master Shi and Guanding in their attempts to legitimate the Sanlun and Tiantai traditions. In fact, the text begins with a list of sūtras and other authoritative texts upon which it relies, and the *Transmission of*

---

[56] "The Emergence of the Taoist Papacy," 98.

[57] "The Emergence of the Taoist Papacy," 99, drawing on Verellen, *Du Guanting (850–933): Taoïste de cour à la fin de la Chine médiévale.*

[58] "The Emergence of the Taoist Papacy," 104–5.

[59] In her recent study of this text, Adamek offers a summary of text, 19–21, which makes clear how very complex the text is, with lineage just one in an array of issues. She also notes that "we can discern tension between the regard for lineage and the desire to affirm Wuzhu's uniqueness" (*The Mystique of Transmission*, 34).

the Dharma Treasury, under a variant title as a *jing* 經, a sūtra, rather than a *zhuan* 傳, or history, appears among the sūtras and before the lesser histories, accounts (*ji* 記), and assorted other texts.[60]

After narrating the introduction of Buddhism to China under Emperor Ming 明 of the Later Han 後漢 (r. 57–75) and refuting the notorious 'converting the barbarians' allegation that the Chinese sage Laozi taught Buddhism in India as an watered-down version of Daoism, the text presents an ingenious new formulation of Chan transmission.[61] It cites the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, lists the twenty-four names found in it and then, without indicating that it has come to the end of the transmission found in *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, names Śāṇakavāsin as Siṃha's heir. Śāṇakavāsin had already appeared as the fourth figure in the series, but here his name is given in an alternative Chinese transliteration, making him, in effect, a different person.[62] This alternative transliteration derives from the *Meditation Sūtra* and its prefaces and comes to the *Record of the Dharma-Jewel*, like so much else, through Shenhui.[63] Did the author of the *Record of the Dharma-Jewel* realize that the two transliterations were of the same name? Scholars have imputed a certain cunning to the author of the *Record of the Dharma-Jewel*, which may or may not be warranted in some cases, but the clumsiness of the handling of the names of Bodhidharma, Dharmatrāta, and Bodhidharmatrāta, described below, raises the possibility that the two transcriptions were perceived as representing two distinct individuals.

The *Record of the Dharma-Jewel* next retells the story of Siṃha's death found in the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, altering certain details to heighten its dramatic impact. As the wicked king prepares to behead Siṃha "with his own hands," he warns the anti-Buddhist religious leaders who had urged him on of the consequences

---

[60] See Yanagida's annotated text, *Shoki no zenshi I*, 39.

[61] On the 'converting the barbarians' theory, see Livia Kohn, *Laughing at the Tao: Debates among Buddhists and Daoists in Medieval China*, 1995. On the question of this new lineage formulation, Welter notes that Wuzhu and/or his students were laying claim to more than one line of descent (*Monks, Rulers, and Literati*, 53–4), while Adamek attempts to 'locate' Wuzhu within 'patterns of ideological opposition' to other figures discussed by the *Lidai fabao ji* (*The Mystique of Transmission*, 214–8).

[62] See Yanagida, *Shoki no zenshi I*, 65, and Adamek, "Issues in Chinese Buddhist Transmission," 150.

[63] On the historical and intellectual debts the *Lidai fabao ji* owes Shenhui, see Adamek, *The Mystique of Transmission*, 20, 192.

should Siṃha prove to be a sage. Decapitated, Siṃha miraculously bleeds milk.[64] The king puts his advisors to death, and the text assures us that the ground was sprinkled with their blood. Only after this gory reprisal does the king take refuge in the teachings of the Buddha and become a patron of Siṃha's disciple, the second Śāṇakavāsin. As if to rationalize and compensate for the violent death of a patriarch, the *Record of the Dharma-Jewel* hastens to add that, "Because of bhikṣu ha, the Buddhadharma was revived."[65]

The second Śāṇakavāsin transmits to a (second) Upagupta. Again, the name of one of the traditional five masters of the dharma is given in the alternative transliteration found in the *Meditation Sūtra* and its prefaces, presumably reaching the author of the *Record of the Dharma-Jewel* through the conduit of Shenhui. The dharma heir after the second Upagupta is unmistakably drawn from Shenhui's list of thirteen patriarchs since the rendition of his name repeats Shenhui's garbling of a name from the *Meditation Sūtra* and its prefaces. After one more name from the *Meditation Sūtra*, we come to 'Bodhidharmatrāta,' a curious compound of the established figure Bodhidharma and the name Dharmatrāta from the *Meditation Sūtra*. This awkward splice of the two names betrays the origins of the names, the motive of the text in combining them, and perhaps also a Chinese perception of Indian names as seemingly endless.

The *Record of the Dharma-Jewel* directly criticizes Jingjue, author of the *Record of the Masters and Disciples of the Laṅkā[vatāra]*, for identifying Guṇabhadra as the first patriarch: "In the absence of any evidence, he led later adepts into error by claiming that Guṇabhadra was the master of the master-patriarch Bodhidharma."[66] The *Record of the Dharma-Jewel* also reacts against Jingjue's moderate stance toward language, insisting that the written word plays no role in the transmission of the truth: "Furthermore, the teaching that they transmit follows the letter, whereas the Chan method of the school of the

[64] The *Lidai fabao ji* borrows the milk-for-blood motif when narrating Huike's famous loss of limb. See *Shoki no zenshi I*, 77, and translation in Adamek, *The Mystique of Transmission*, 314. Like Siṇha, Huike is also executed and again bleeds milk. See *Shoki no zenshi I*, 78, and comment and translation in Adamek, *The Mystique of Transmission*, 146–7, 314–5.

[65] See *Shoki no zenshi I*, 59.

[66] As translated by Faure, *The Will to Orthodoxy*, 175.

master-patriarch Bodhidharma has no written teaching at all: it transmits the mind seal in silence."[67]

The *Record of the Dharma-Jewel* also offers an explanation of the *Meditation Sūtra* that connects "Bodhidharmatrāta" to Huiyuan in a novel way.[68] The translator Buddhabhadra vanishes, replaced by two 'brahmins' named Buddha and Yaśas, disciples of Bodhidharmatrāta who visit Huiyuan on Mt. Lu, translate the text, promptly die, and are buried on the mountain.[69] Why does the *Record of the Dharma-Jewel* take this odd detour around Buddhabhadra? Perhaps he is too closely associated with other translations, especially 'Hīnayāna' texts and ideas, or perhaps he is associated with Tiantai, thanks to Guanding's early reference to him.

The Seven Buddhas and Verses: *The Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch*

The earliest version of the well-known *Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch*, as represented by the two nearly identical manuscripts found at Dunhuang, the earliest layers of which have been dated 780, adopts many of the genealogical innovations of the *Record of the Dharma-Jewel*. To the head of the list of patriarchs, however, it adds "the seven buddhas of the past."[70] Since Huineng's audience at one point proclaims him to be a buddha, this inclusion makes sense on one level.[71] If patriarchs are buddhas, the buddhas of the past must also have been part of the patriarchal transmission. This inclusion of the seven buddhas of the past is the strongest possible contradiction of the theory of decline that gave rise to the tradition of the five dharma masters in Indian and inspired the appearance in Chinese of the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*. The inclusion of the seven buddhas of the past

[67] As translated by Faure, *The Will to Orthodoxy*, 175.

[68] Although it is the *Meditation Sūtra* that is meant here, given the reference to Huiyuan, the title given is *Chanmen jing* 禪門經 [Meditation-Gate Sūtra]. See Adamek, *The Mystique of Transmission*, 37.

[69] See Adamek's intriguing analysis of this episode, from a different angle, *The Mystique of Transmission*, 36–40.

[70] See Yampolsky, *Platform Sutra*, 27, in the Chinese text and 179 in the translation. For the other manuscript, see Pan Chonggui, *Dunhuang Tanjing xinshu*.

[71] See Yampolsky, *Platform Sutra*, 19 in the Chinese text and 162 in the translation.

also contravenes the notion of an intimate face-to-face transmission of the deepest understanding.

The seven buddhas of the past are traditionally believed to have met during one buddha's lifetime as a buddha and the next buddha's lifetime as a new aspirant to buddhahood. The awakening of the second buddha thus takes place many lifetimes after their meeting. (As we will see in a later chapter, Qisong objected strongly to the inclusion of the seven buddhas of the past in the lineage, and his arguments on this point contain clues about his conception of transmission as well as his approach to editing the text of the *Platform Sūtra*.)

The *Platform Sūtra* introduces another new feature to the developing tradition. Verses recited at the time of transmission by Bodhidharma through Huineng displace the device of the transmission of the robe. In other matters, however, the *Platform Sūtra* follows the *Record of the Dharma-Jewel* fairly faithfully. It repeats the *Record of the Dharma-Jewel* presentation of alternative transliterations for Śāṇakavāsin and Upagupta. It follows the *Record of the Dharma-Jewel* in accepting Shenhui's mistake of Śubhamitra for the *Meditation Sūtra*'s Vasumitra. The Dunhuang version of the *Platform Sūtra* does, however, omit one patriarch and reverse the order of two others, presumably by accident.

Schlütter, in a recent article that represents one aspect of a much larger project he is undertaking on the *Platform Sūtra*, reminds us that the Dunhuang version does not identify a single heir for Huineng and indeed never claims explicitly that the ten disciples named for Huineng are his dharma heirs.[72] Schlütter observes, "The real heir to Huineng's Dharma is the *Platform Sūtra* itself which, it is repeatedly stressed, is crucial if a person is to see his own nature."[73] This attitude, less true in later versions, serves as an index of Chan development in that the nature of religious authority was still in flux and far from fully fixed at this point.

Putting it all Together: The *Baolin zhuan*

The next important text in this series is the *Baolin zhuan* 寶林傳 [Transmission of the Baolin [Monastery]], written in 801 by Zhiju 智

[72] "Transmission and Enlightenment in Chan Buddhism Seen Through the *Platform Sūtra*," 392.
[73] "Transmission and Enlightenment in Chan Buddhism," 392.

炬 and by far the most successful formulation of Chan lineage up to that point.[74] Zhiju made a number of changes—one might even say improvements—to the lineage. He seems to have been the first to draw directly on both the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* and the *Meditation Sūtra*. He returns to the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* for all the names of direct dharma heirs it contains and then inserts within that series, for reasons that escape me, one name from the *Meditation Sūtra*.

But the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* offers no names after that of the ill-fated Siṃha, and Zhiju elected not to take the last two names on the list in the *Meditation Sūtra*. The first of these had already been borrowed by Shenhui and the second identified with Bodhidharma, uses which had more or less been repeated in the *Record of the Dharma-Jewel* and *Platform Sūtra*. Zhiju had the two early works side-by-side, making it patently clear by the position of Śāṇakavāsin and Upagupta that the two sets of different transliterations referred to the same figures, and he did not opt to retain the double appearance of these patriarchs. Zhiju instead chooses to bridge the gap between Siṃha and Bodhidharma with three entirely new names. Previous scholarship has often emphasizes Zhiju's inventiveness;[75] I would stress that he may have felt himself forced into this act of creativity.

---

[74] Zhiju 智炬 is sometimes identified as Huiju 慧炬. See Tokiwa Daijō 常盤大定, *Hōrinden no kenkyū* 宝林伝の研究. Robson summarizes and furthers the scholarship on Zhiju's identity and the possible links between the *Baolin zhuan*, Nanyue, and the Huairang-Mazu lineage in "Imagining Nanyue," 535–8. Since the author is otherwise unknown, a number of scholars have speculated about his identity. Building on Yanagida's supposition that he was a student of Mazu's, Jinhua Jia has argued that Zhiju was in fact Zhangjing Huaihui and that the text is the *Lengqie shizi ji* under a different name (*The Hongzhou School of Chan Buddhism*, 84–9).

Yampolsky describes the text as providing "an entirely new tradition of the Seven Buddhas of the Past and of the twenty-eight Indian Patriarchs, one which was adopted by all later Ch'an histories, and came to represent the tradition as accepted today" (*Platform Sutra*, 47–8). Faure writes, "The *Baolin zhuan* introduced the era of the records of the transmission of the lamp (*chuandeng lu*) and the recorded sayings (*yulu*) and brings to a close that of the Chan sūtras—apocryphal texts whose blossoming, beginning in the middle of the seventh century, had provided a basis for the legitimation of the new school" (*The Will to Orthodoxy*, 2). The *Baolin zhuan* and the *Platform Sūtra*, seem also to have been the sources for a transmission scheme found in an esoteric text preserved at Dunhuang. Tanaka Ryōshō has written on the topic ("Relations between the Buddhist Sects in the T'ang Dynasty through Ms. P. 3913"), and the current research of Amanda Goodman on the topic should shed further light.

[75] See Yanagida, *Shoki zenshū*, 370–1.

The *Transmission of the Baolin* is remarkable in part because Zhiju not only supplies this reinforced lineage but lavishes attention on its members. From numerous works, he culled material for expanded biographies.[76] Here too perhaps we may suspect that, as with the names of the Indian patriarchs, Zhiju drew on sources when possible and invented of whole cloth when needed. As we will see in later chapters, later works like the *Jingde chuandeng lu*, appearing in the first decade of the eleventh century, often borrow from *Transmission of the Baolin* stories that are unattested elsewhere but do not credit the *Transmission of the Baolin*, which may have carried a sectarian or suspect reputation.

The *Transmission of the Baolin* picks up from the *Platform Sūtra* both of its significant innovations: the seven buddhas and the transmission verses. Although Zhiju does not count the seven buddhas in his numbered list of patriarchs, we know that he devoted some pages to them before he began describing the Indian patriarchs. Unfortunately, because the section describing the seven buddhas is missing from the surviving text, we do not know precisely how Zhiju understood their place or relation to the transmission. In the case of the transmission verses, which in the *Platform Sūtra* are limited to the line from Bodhidharma to Huineng, Zhiju provides them for all the patriarchs of India and China.

All in all, the *Transmission of the Baolin* makes ingenious use of all the sources available to create a transmission in which all the figures are named and described. Gone is the uneven, cobbled-together feeling of its predecessors. A reader steeped in the Chinese historical tradition is given all he might expect in the way of family background and dates. The *Transmission of the Baolin* may have also claimed, for additional reassurance, that Zhiju consulted an Indian trepiṭaka master called Shengchi 勝持 on the verses of the patriarchs. Although this story does not appear in the partial *Transmission of the Baolin* we now possess, it is reported in two works of the mid-Song.[77]

The last fascicle of the *Transmission of the Baolin*, in which the last of its lineage claims would have appeared and made its sectarian origins clearer, has been lost since the late tenth century. Despite this,

---

[76] See Tokiwa Daijō, *Shina Bukkyō no kenkyū*, II, 303–26.

[77] See Yanagida, *Shoki zenshū*, 351–2, for these passages in Weibo's 1103 *Da zangjing gangmu zhiyao lu* and the 1108 preface to the *Zuting shiyuan*.

scholars have long believed that it was written in support of the tradition of Mazu Daoyi 馬祖道一 (709–788), often called the Hongzhou 洪州 school after the location of Mazu's temple in Jiangxi.[78] Later sources claim that Mazu's teacher, Nanyue Huairang 南岳懷讓 (677–744) had been a disciple of Huineng, though his name does not appear in the *Platform Sūtra* or other eighth-century works. Although, due to the missing last fascicle, we cannot know whether the *Transmission of the Baolin* claimed a single exclusive transmission to Huairang or was content to place him among Huineng's acknowledged disciples, we can learn a little about Zhiju's attitude toward transmission from his treatment of an extended collateral line deriving from Siṃha.

The *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* had presented Madhyāntika as a collateral heir of sorts, since he and Śāṇakavāsin both receive the dharma from Ānanda, and yet Śāṇakavāsin alone goes on to transmit it. In other words, there may be multiple heirs, but only one can transmit, ensuring a single line of descent. (The *Meditation Sūtra*, by contrast, includes him in a list that suggests that he received the dharma from Ānanda and transmitted it to Śāṇakavāsin.) In addition to the modest precedent of Madhyāntika, we find in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳 a story of Daoxin on his deathbed, beseeched by students to name a successor, asserting that he had made not a few transmissions.[79] The *Transmission of the Baolin*, however, includes a lengthy section on a collateral branch of four generations, encompassing twenty-two men, descending from Siṃha. Since so many of the sources Zhiju cites are not extant, it is impossible to know to what extent this is the result of creative reading or outright invention. Given Siṃha's role in the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* as the last to whom the dharma was transmitted, it is certainly interesting that this collateral line springs from him. Indeed, the account of a proper heir and a collateral branch may be read as a forceful refutation of the decline of the dharma.

[78] Shiina Kōyū's work on fragments of the missing sections, including a biography of Shitou Xiqian has thrown this assumption into question. See "Hōrinden makikyū makijū no itsuban." James Robson has recently speculated on a possible link between the *Baolin zhuan* and Nanyue as well as its possibly reconciliatory stance toward Daoist practitioners ("Imagining Nanyue: A religious history of the Southern Marchmount through the Tang dynasty (618–907)," 535–8).

[79] T.50.2060.606b. See McRae, *The Northern School*, 31–2, for a translation of the whole entry.

At any rate, the *Transmission of the Baolin* may have contributed to—as well as reflected—a general shift in thinking about collateral lines. Faure notes that by the late eighth century, as the emerging Niutou 牛頭, or Oxhead, school began to identify itself in terms of lineage, collateral descent, in its case from Daoxin through Farong 法融 (594–657), was nothing to be ashamed of.[80]

Two Epitaphs: Windows on Literati Perceptions

In 817, the famous poet Bai Juyi 白居易 (772–846) wrote an epitaph for Xingshan Weikuan 興善惟寬 (775–817), a student of the great master Mazu Daoyi.[81] In it, he places a number of well-known Chan masters in relation to Mazu and each other as father, brothers, cousins, and uncles of varying degree. Bai employs this family language to make the point that although there is a senior branch that constitutes the true heirs, the Chan 'clan' encompasses other lines, just like a great family with collateral lines.[82] In other words, Bai echoes his fellow layman Li Hua's inclusive attitude, while at the same time emphasizing the hierarchy among family branches. Bai refers explicitly to great clans, and his model reflects this model, rather than that of an imperial family in which the central role of the emperor and proper succession are paramount. Bai also offers a curious account of the Indian transmission, which confirms that it had not yet been standardized.[83]

A well-known contemporary of Bai Juyi, the great writer and Confucian revivalist Liu Zongyuan 柳宗元 (773–819), wrote an epitaph for

[80] *The Will to Orthodoxy*, 5. For more on Niutou lineage claims, see Poceski, *Ordinary Mind as the Way*, 97–9.

[81] For information on Weikuan, see Mario Poceski, *Ordinary Mind as the Way*, esp. 64–66.

[82] See Jorgensen, "The Imperial Lineage of Ch'an Buddhism," 122, as well as the comments of Poceski, *Ordinary Mind as the Way*, 102.

[83] Poceski has made virtually the same observation (*Ordinary Mind as the Way*, 105). Bai mentions Mahākāśyapa at the head, Aśvaghoṣa as the twelfth, Siṃha as the twenty-fourth, and Buddhasena as the fiftieth, followed by Bodhidharma through Huineng, Huairang, Mazu Daoyi, and finally Weikuan as the fifty-ninth. As Yanagida has noted, Bai seems to be drawing on the Sarvāstivādin list in the *Chu sanzang ji ji* for the numbers and names (*Shoki zenshū*, 396–7). By taking Dharmatrāta to be Bodhidharma, as Shenhui had, Bai is able to graft onto this list the six masters from Bodhidharma to Huineng. He then works his way down to Weikuan through Huairang and Mazu.

Ruhai 如海 (727–809), a student of Xuansu 玄素 (688–752), a master in the Oxhead school of Chan. In it, Liu provides an intriguing preface to Ruhai's comments on the state of Buddhism.

> The birth[place] of the Buddha is twenty thousand *li* distant from China. His death occurred two thousand years ago. For this reason, the transmitted path is ever more weak, and [those who] speak of 'Chan' do the most harm…[Ruhai] says, 'From Mahākāśyapa to Siṃha, there were twenty-three generations. [Bodhi]dharma was even more distant. To [Hong] ren, it was five generations farther. [Shen]xiu and [Hui]neng were even more removed. The north and south criticize each other…The path is gradually becoming hidden, alas!'[84]

Liu makes a classic statement of remoteness from the Buddha in time and space, which results in a fading of the Buddhist tradition. He criticizes those who "speak of 'Chan,'" and although he does not explain himself, we may guess from similar comments made by some of his contemporaries that he objects to the naming of Chan as separate from the tradition as a whole.

Liu then arrives at the subject of the epitaph, Ruhai, who seems to have understood Chan transmission itself to be in decline.[85] Ruhai's juxtaposition of Chan and decline is novel. It also makes sense as the statement of a member of the Oxhead transmission, which claimed to be a collateral line through the fourth Chinese patriarch Daoxin. Ruhai may, in fact, be making a virtue of a weakness by suggesting that this 'inferior' derivation is actually better, a superior source of teaching, than that of the squabbling northern and southern schools.

A Buddhist Critic

For all the familiarity, and thus perhaps invisibility, of lineage claims in a genealogically-minded society, some Buddhist observers did perceive the growing prevalence of lineage as something new. Some expressed

[84] "Longan [Ru]hai chan shi bei" in *Liu hedong ji*, 20–2. My translation and interpretation differ from those of McRae in "The Oxhead School of Chinese Ch'an Buddhism," 202. Halperin also discusses this passage and, noting that Liu wrote the inscription at the request of the court but did not mention sudden awakening or suggest that Chan was superior, argues sectarian attitudes mostly didn't emerge until later (*Out of the Cloister*, 57).

[85] Note that Ruhai presents a synopsis of Chan transmission closer to the form eventually adopted as standard than does Bai Juyi.

doubts about particularly dubious historical claims. One outspoken critic, Shenqing 神清 (d. 814), himself a former participant in the Jingzhong 淨眾 community of Wuxiang, did this while also questioning the need for this sort of authority at all.[86] He asks, "If one's meditation and virtues are of themselves lofty, why wait to transmit the dharma and then start a school?"[87] In other words, why do we need this device of lineage to justify what is inherently authoritative, i.e., effective practices and self-apparent probity?

In a later chapter, we will examine some of Shenqing's specific objections along with Qisong's often violent reactions to them. For now let us simply take note of Shenqing in order to complicate the seemingly inexorable spread of genealogical thinking.

The Song biographer of eminent monks Zanning places Shenqing in the section of exegetes, and Shiina Kōyū describes Shenqing as a representative mid-Tang scholar-monk with interests ranging over all forms of Buddhism, including Chan.[88] In his *Beishan lu* 北山錄, Shenqing tells us that he studied Chan with Wuxiang, the Silla prince-turned-monk for whom Jingzhong Monastery 淨眾寺 in Chengdu, Sichuan was built. Shenqing makes a number of objections to the teachings of the Baotang 寶唐 teacher Wuzhu 無住 (714–774), the leader of the community that produced the *Lidai fabao ji* and who claimed Wuxiang as his teacher, suggesting that objections to dharma transmission may in fact be objections to a particular dharma heir. (Since the actual link between Wuxiang and Wuzhu is questionable, Shenqing's comments may also reflect his desire to steer attention away from lineage claims, which can be made without much basis, and toward the essentials of practice.)[89] At any rate, it is worth considering that these criticisms of dharma transmission arise not from an opponent of all things Chan but from a sympathetic partial participant with a possible animus toward one lineage claimant.

---

[86] *Beishan lu*, T.52.2113.611b8. For Shenqing 神清, see Zanning's account of him in the *Song gaoseng zhuan*, T.50.2061.740–1. Shenqing has attracted less scholarly attention than he deserves, but Aramaki Noritoshi 荒牧典俊 has written a piece on him ("*Hokuzan roku* no tachiba to 'Nanshūzen' izen no Nanshūzen" 北山録の立場と「南宗禅」以前の南宗禅. On the date of his death, see Shiina Kōyū, "'Hokuzan roku' ni tsuite," 430. Shiina relies on Yuan sources to establish this dating.

[87] *Beishan lu*, T.52.2113.611c22. The Chinese reads 禪德自高。寧俟傳法。然後始為宗教者歟。One might also read the first phrase as "the virtue of one's meditation." See also Adamek, 277–8.

[88] "'Hokuzan roku' ni tsuite," 430.

[89] On the relationship between Wuxiang and Wuzhu and Shenqing's attitude toward both, see Adamek, *The Mystique of Transmission*, chap. 6 and 276–83, respectively.

A Scholar with a Lineage: Zongmi

Guifeng Zongmi 圭峰宗密 (780–841), a figure of special prominence in Chinese Buddhist history thanks to the erudition and innovative thinking displayed in his diverse writings, is often described as a patriarch of both the Chan and Huayan traditions. To be more exact, he himself claimed to be an heir to Chan transmission and only posthumously was named as a Huayan patriarch, due to his studies with the great Huayan scholar Qingliang Chengguan 清凉澄觀 (738–839).[90] Like Shenqing, Zongmi had broad interests. Unlike Shenqing, however, Zongmi accepted the notion of dharma transmission without regarding his Chan affiliation as out of keeping with his exegetical activities. Even as he devoted considerable energy to investigating and evaluating the state of contemporary Chan teaching and transmission, he undertook extensive study with Chengguan and engaged deeply with the *Huayan jing* and Mahāyāna literature more broadly.[91]

As has often been noted, Zongmi's writings on Chan describe a multi-branched transmission which is simultaneously hierarchical and inclusive.[92] That is, while different lines are ranked in terms of their

[90] Zongmi claimed transmission, a few generations removed, from the famous Heze Shenhui. Modern scholars have cast doubt on this connection and suggested that Zongmi's teacher in fact belonged to a line of the above-mentioned Jingzhong transmission from Wuxiang, one of whose students was also named Shenhui, and that Zongmi took advantage of this coincidence to identify himself with the more famous main line of Chan transmission. Peter Gregory points out that Zongmi did, in fact, enjoy a connection to Heze Shenhui through a member of the Jingzhong line said to have studied with both of the masters named Shenhui. Gregory further observes that the claim on Heze Shenhui probably predates Zongmi. It was likely his master Daoyuan's master Nanyin or Weizhong who first made this claim (*Tsung-mi and the Sinification of Buddhism*, 35–49).

[91] See Gregory's biography of Zongmi in *Tsung-mi and the Sinification of Buddhism*, 27–90, for a thoughtful treatment of how Zongmi was inspired to become a monk thanks to an encounter with a Chan monk and later brought his Chan sensibilities and education to a deep engagement with Huayan teachings. Gregory notes that Zongmi may have been particularly attracted to Chengguan because of Chengguan's "infusion of Ch'an ideas and perspectives" into his Huayan writings (65). More recently, Broughton has emphasized Zongmi's self-identification as Chan as a corrective to Japanese scholarship that stresses his Huayan studies to the point of viewing his Chan as 'impure' and 'syncretic' (*Zongmi on Chan*, 59–60).

[92] Jan Yün-hua, perhaps influenced by his admiration for Zongmi's willingness to cross what Jan perceives to be rigid borders between different traditions within Chinese Buddhism, emphasizes the "non-sectarian" aspect of Zongmi's analysis of various Chan groups ("Tsung-mi: His Analysis of Ch'an Buddhism," 1–54, esp. 29). McRae and Faure point out that although Zongmi assumes an objective air, he does rank these groups, and the tradition with which he claims affiliation always reigns supreme (McRae, "Review of J.C. Cleary, *Zen Dawn*," 142; Faure, *The Will to Orthodoxy*, 4).

methods as well as their descent, and certain teachers and approaches come in for rather pointed criticism, Zongmi makes room for all. As Foulk remarks, Zongmi "was the first to conceive and name the 'Ch'an lineage' in China as an extended clan that had many legitimate branches stemming from the first patriarch Bodhidharma."[93] Although this notion is foreshadowed in the writings of lay Buddhists (and quite likely amenable to some of their monastic Chan teachers), Zongmi is the first Chan dharma heir known to present it in writing.

The necessary precursor to a multi-branched Chan family tree is the ability of masters to transmit the dharma to more than one disciple. This posed a problem for Zongmi, who proclaimed himself a spiritual descendent of Shenhui, since Shenhui had insisted that there could be only one true heir per generation. To resolve this, Zongmi explains, "After the seventh generation [the transmission] was not restricted to one man."[94] To complicate matters, in a later work, Zongmi writes, "If there is a sympathetic resonance and reciprocal tallying [between master and disciple], then although a single flame may be transmitted to a hundred thousand lamps, there will be no difference between them."[95] Even if Zongmi is talking here about generations after the seventh, when more than one heir is permitted, how can all these transmissions be identical if just one branch of the Chan family is the main or direct line? For what reason is one group superior? Perhaps Zongmi's genealogical rankings cannot but conflict with his willingness to affirm the (identical) enlightenment available to any number of students.

---

[93] "Controversies Concerning the 'Separate Transmission,'" 233.

[94] Translation from the *Yuanjue jing lueshu chao* by Jorgensen, "The Imperial Lineage," 109. The *Platform Sūtra* makes clear that Huineng alone was the true heir of Hongren. When Huineng is on the verge of death, however, he identifies ten disciples and charges them with the transmission of the *Platform Sūtra*. Huineng praises Shenhui in particular, but he does not name him as sole successor or heir. The lack of a definitive statement opened the way for later groups to insert themselves. In documents studied by Marjorie Topley, a number of late imperial 'sectarian groups,' including that called "Xiantian dadao" 先天大道, claim that they are the rightful heirs of the orthodox teachings of Huineng through a previously unacknowledged lay heir and transmit authority through a series of patriarchs: "after the sixth patriarch, the Great Way passed to those dwelling in the fire," i.e., householders ("The Great Way of Former Heaven: A Group of Chinese Secret Religious Sects," 364–6).

[95] Translation by Sharf, *Coming to Terms with Chinese Buddhism*, 132. Sharf, concerned with the language of stimulus and response, or *ganying* 感應, comments that in Zongmi's formulation, "to transmit the dharma is to conjure a Buddha, rendering the dharma-heir a 'living icon' worthy of ritual veneration" (132).

Confucian Stirrings

Jorgensen suggests that Shenhui's ideas about Chan transmission, mediated by Zongmi, influenced his contemporaries Han Yu 韓愈 (768–824) and Li Ao 李翱 (c. 772–c. 836) in their conception of a transmission from the sage-kings to Kongzi and Mengzi.[96] Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200) later suggested that this transmission was revived in the early Song by Zhou Dunyi 周敦頤 (1027–1073). Zhu famously named it *daotong* 道統, or transmission of the way, and *daotong* became a crucial part of the Song revival of Confucian learning, subject to many revisions as various figures were included and excluded. Jorgensen writes, "Thus a Ch'an idea, itself influenced by Confucianism, entered into the Neo-Confucianism of the literati where it remained an enduring element in Chinese thought."[97] But the story of Buddhist 'influence' on a key idea in the revival of Confucianism is probably more complex and more interesting than this.

As Barrett has written, "[F]or centuries Neo-Confucians have been plagued with accusations that their own conception of spiritual lineage was originally derived from that of the Ch'an patriarchate," a debate Barrett and others have found compelling, even as they caution scholars not to accept its traditional terms unthinkingly.[98] Thomas Wilson, in particular, has taken care to describe the possible ways in which Buddhist lineage served as a model for Confucian revivalists while

[96] Jorgensen, "The Imperial Lineage," 123–4. On Li's dates, see Barrett, *Li Ao: Buddhist, Taoist, or neo-Confucian?* 39–40, 156–7. On the probability that Li contributed significantly to Han's famous construction of a Confucian genealogy, see Barrett, *Li Ao*, 142–6, and "Review of Thomas A. Wilson, *Genealogy of the Way*," 598. As Barrett notes, although Li did not concern himself with the sage-kings, i.e., a transmission preceding Confucius, he does display confidence that he himself represents a continuation of the transmission. For a translation of Han's famous statement of the genealogy, see Wilson, *Genealogy of the Way*, 78–9. David McMullen has observed that Han lamented the lack of strong master-disciple relations within *ru* circles of his day, so unlike the effective passing down of tradition by artists and musicians. One ninth-century student of Han admired the results of the Buddhist emphasis on master-disciple relationships enough to suggest that Confucians imitate it (*State and Scholars in T'ang China*, 65).

[97] Jorgensen, "The Imperial Lineage," 125.

[98] Barrett, "Kill the Patriarchs!" 87. See Wilson, *Genealogy of the Way*, 79–81, for a discussion of the most recent argument over the possibility of Chan Buddhist influence on Han and the problems inherent in regarding Han as passively influenced by Buddhism or Confucianism itself as a pristine entity contaminated by Buddhist concepts.

stressing the Confucian 'redeployment' of genealogical language.[99] By defusing anxiety about Buddhist influence on Confucians, Wilson is able to perceive more clearly the circumstances and particularities of Confucian uses of genealogy. Barrett, for his part, reminds us that Li Ao was most likely familiar with Tiantai as well as Chan notions of lineage.[100] Indeed, the way that Tiantai transmission makes sense of discontinuity may have made it a more pertinent model for the Confucian case. Whether by influence or common situation, both the Tiantai tradition as it emerged in the Tang and the neo-Confucian tradition as it emerged in the Song grappled with the balance between revered texts and those figures who 'rediscovered' and interpreted them.[101]

The work of Barrett and Wilson makes clear that Tang Confucians were struggling with their own fears about deterioration and external threats. They did not face persecution per se or inherit a theory of inevitable decline, but they greatly feared the loss of a distinct and 'pure' Confucian tradition. This fear arose from awareness of encroachment by Buddhists and Daoists, on one hand, and the effect of the political disorder following the Han, on the other.[102] Barrett points out that although Kongzi presented himself as the "self-appointed heir of these sages [Yao and Shun]: there is no question of any direct thread of succession between himself and figures so remote."[103] Did

[99] *Genealogy of the Way*, chap. 2–3. Peter Bol argues that in conceptualizing *daotong*, Wilson overemphasizes the analogy of kinship and slights the importance of the idea of *zhengtong* 正統, or legitimate political succession ("Review of Wilson, *Genealogy of the Way*," 564–72). There may be some merit to his criticism, especially in the assertion that political legitimacy is also an important metaphor in *ru* conceptions of authoritative succession, but Bol weakens his own point when he argues that genealogy cannot be the governing metaphor of *daotong* because the sage-kings Yao and Shun both rejected kinship in favor of individual worth as the criterion for choosing a successor. Both Buddhist lineage and Confucian *daotong* draw a certain potency from, on the one hand, an idealistic picture of descent in which sons are identical to fathers, and, on the other hand, the fact that in most cases they are not. Furthermore, that in Buddhist lineage and in *daotong*, the 'son' is not a biological son allows for the drama of the 'father' and 'son' looking for and finding each other.

[100] "Review of Thomas A. Wilson, *Genealogy of the Way*," 598.

[101] See Stevenson, 33–9, and Penkower, "In the Beginning," 263–5, on "received and inspired truth" and Ellen Neskar, "The Cult of Worthies," 309–11, on 'inspired individuals' and 'canonical texts.' See also Bol, *"This Culture of Ours"*, 164, on Liu Kai and his sense of belonging to a line of sages. On Liu's unlikely association with Zanning, see Welter, *Monks, Rulers, and Literati*, 169.

[102] See Barrett, "Kill the Patriarchs!" 92.

[103] Barrett, "Kill the Patriarchs!" 90. Penkower suggests that the fact that Li Hua used the expression *zushi* 祖師 for Huisi rather than Huiwen "leav[es] the impression that the term was being used in a more general sense meaning something like 'the

Confucians in the Tang and the Song invent for themselves a firmer connection to their historical tradition much as their erstwhile Buddhist rivals did? The answer seems to be both yes and no. Confucians of the Tang and Song never postulate an unbroken Chan-like line of transmission; indeed, much like their Tiantai counterparts, they discuss and interpret the gaps in the transmission even as they celebrate those heroes responsible to reviving the transmission. Furthermore, as Ellen Neskar has pointed out, 'Confucian transmission' has been understood at various times in terms of political, institutional, doctrinal, and literary continuity as well as in terms of genealogy.[104] But some Tang and Song Confucians did emphasize a stronger master-disciple relationship, projecting it into the deep past and attempting to enact it in their own lives. The intimacy of this ideal relationship may derive in part from the Chan Buddhist example. It may also have eventually contributed to Zhu Xi's seemingly Chan-like view of the Dao as a secret teaching.[105]

A More Inclusive Vision: The *Zutang ji* (952)

The *Zutang ji* 祖堂集 [Patriarchs Hall Collection] was composed in Fujian by disciples of Zhaoqing Wendeng 招慶文僜 (884–972) who claimed descent from Huineng through a line including Qingyuan Xingsi 青原行思 (d. 740), Shitou Xiqian 石頭希遷 (700–790), and Xuefeng Yicun 雪峰義存 (822–908).[106] As a number of scholars have noted, the *Patriarchs Hall Collection* draws heavily on the *Transmission of the Baolin* as well as the writings of Zongmi. Unlike its predecessors, however, it does not describe the lineage of its compilers as the only legitimate transmission. Instead, as Wendeng makes clear in his preface, after Huineng, there is no distinguishing between a main line and collateral branches; all are simply descendents.[107] (At the same time, as

substance of this tradition goes back to Hui-ssu, although the essence of the teaching goes back farther to Hui-wen and Nagarjuna'" ("Making and Remaking," 17).

104 Ellen Neskar, "The Cult of Worthies," 303, 313–50.

105 See Wilson, *Genealogy of the Way*, 82, and, for a dissenting view, Bol, "Review of Wilson, *Genealogy of the Way*," 566.

106 See Welter, *Monks, Rulers, and Literati*, 63–5, for a summary of Yanagida's findings on the text, an evaluation of Kinugawa's theory of later expanded composition, and a detailing of the lay patronage supporting its compilation.

107 See *Sodō shū*, trans. Yanagida Seizan, 2. Foulk discusses this point in his "Ch'an Myths," chap. 1.

Welter notes, preference is given to those in the line of Mazu Daoyi, to whom Wendeng connected himself, "by placing their biographies in the final fascicles, giving the impression that the Chan legacy culminates in their activities.")[108]

For this reason, the *Patriarchs Hall Collection* presents an extensive genealogy. The compilers of the *Patriarchs Hall Collection* include many eminent figures without living descendents, and, as Foulk has suggested, they are nevertheless presented proudly as ancestors.[109] This represents an interesting juncture in the development of Chan lineage. Rather than focus on their own lineage exclusively or even with marked preference, the compilers construct a vision of many ancestors in a large extended clan. As Welter puts it, "One of the main purposes of early *denglu* collections is to present a harmonious picture of a fragmentary movement, a kind of 'common front' or outward face that was easily understood and accepted as Chan's public persona."[110]

The Triumph of Affiliation: The *Jingde chuandeng lu*

The *Jingde chuandeng lu* 景德傳燈錄 [Jingde Record of the Transmission of the Lamp], compiled by Daoyuan 道原, is generally considered to be the paradigmatic transmission text.[111] Compiled by Daoyuan, completed at the Song court by a group of civil officials, immediately approved for the imperially-sponsored Buddhist canon, and published around 1009, the text enjoyed imperial support of a higher order than had been seen before.[112] It is also a work of a different magnitude than its predecessors. The *Patriarchs Hall Collection* took the first step towards inclusivity, and the *Jingde Record* completes the gesture, pro-

---

[108] Welter, *Monks, Rulers, and Literati*, 65. Welter, 65–70, also discusses the way in which Wendeng and disciples claimed affiliation with Mazu, despite the lack of an historical connection. He writes, "This suggests that lineage was not the sole criteria through which Chan associations were established. Ideological considerations, the advance of 'true' Chan that cut across formal lineage boundaries, also figured in the formation of Chan linkages" (67).

[109] "Ch'an Myths," 49–50.

[110] Welter, *Monks, Rulers, and Literati*, 68–9.

[111] At the same time, the *Jingde chuandeng lu* is like nothing that came before or after. The exemplar of its genre, it is in some ways unique.

[112] Welter provides an up-to-date summary of scholarship on the *Jingde Record* in *Monks, Rulers, and Literati*, chap. 5, as well as his own research on its textual history, especially the textual changes reflecting re-editing to favor different lineages.

viding entries on almost a thousand figures belonging to a number of different branches.[113]

Scholars, including Welter, whose recent work offers the most detail, have argued that this comprehensive and inclusive approach reflects the unified spirit appropriate for the early years of a unifying dynasty.[114] The *Jingde Record* may also be said to mark an important moment in Chinese Buddhist history, the moment in which lineage affiliation ceases to be the practice of a minority of elite monks and begins to be the norm for elite monks. The admittedly imperfect and artificial categories of translators, exegetes, wonder-workers, meditation specialists, vinaya scholars, self-sacrificers, sermonists, fund-raisers, and preachers inherited and used by Zanning 贊寧 (919–1001) and previous authors of "eminent monk" biographies are displaced to a certain extent by a very different typology, that of lineage.[115] Rather than identifying monks mainly in terms of their activities, in the *Jingde Record* and works to follow in the Chan, Tiantai, and eventually Vinaya traditions, elite monks are described first of all in terms of their lineage affiliations.[116]

Lineage Passes into the Institutional Realm

This conceptual shift from types of monks to lineages of monks may be understood in relation to the fear of decline and the consequent

[113] Welter writes, "In sum, fascicle 4 exhibits the *Chuandeng lu*'s dedication to inclusiveness. In spite of Shenhui's victory in winning recognition for Huineng as sixth patriarch, the *Chuandeng lu* remains committed to acknowledging the accomplishments of masters in collateral lineages, even while accepting the legitimacy of Chan established through 'Southern School' masters" (*Monks, Rulers, and Literati*, 131). Welter also speculates that the text was perhaps even more inclusive than realized, since there was additional text, which has now been lost or was possibly deliberately deleted (131–2).

[114] *The* Linji lu *and Chan Orthodoxy*, 29–39. This attitude did not always hold steady, however, as is evident in the *Tiansheng guangdeng lu* 天聖廣燈錄, a 1036 follow-up work to the *Jingde Record* in which the Linji line is elevated. As Welter describes, "[T]here is no inclusion of masters not on the direct line of orthodox transmission…As if to underscore this point, orthodox transmission is emphasized on a unilineal basis through Linji Yixuan, after which there are multiple lines of transmission" (*Monks, Rulers, and Literati*, 189).

[115] See Kieschnick, *The Eminent Monk*, 8–9, on these categories and on Zanning and his position vis-à-vis Chan and the relative success of the 'eminent monk' genre and Chan lamp histories, 130–8.

[116] See Jan, "Tsung-mi," 26–7, and Gregory, *Tsung-mi*, 21, on Zanning's comment that Zongmi was contested territory.

desire for firm authority. We must also consider its link to a major change in the relation between large monasteries and the early Northern Song state. The Tang state had begun granting name plaques to large monasteries, and the practice greatly accelerated in the early Song, as monastic leaders perceived it as a way to secure recognition as reputable religious communities as well as possible protection from state persecution, and state officials regarded it as a way to supervise religious activity.[117] Consider, for example, the following statement by Li Gou in a 1036 temple inscription:

> Later Bodhidharma lived here to transform the sentient beings. Since he began to transmit the Buddha's Way, [the Buddhist] Way has been without oddities and absurdities, polish and adornment.... However, recent customs are largely corrupt, and some who protect his dharma have been incompetent. At venerable monasteries they have sneaked in among the cloister disciples... The sage emperor ascended to his position and learned with feeling about the deficiencies of the Buddhists. Thus he rescripted: As for all Ch'an monasteries governed by the hands of disciples [of previous abbots] or earlier visitors, after they die, the government will select [appropriate] people to govern them.[118]

As more and more monasteries acquired name plaques, the state developed a new system of classification, according to which the leadership of a given monastery was deemed 'hereditary' or 'public.' At a hereditary monastery, the position of abbot was limited to the monks ordained by a past abbot; from this pool, the monk with seniority within the 'tonsure family' was to serve, after being approved by local officials. At a public monastery, the abbacy was open to prominent monks previously unassociated with the monastery (and it was barred to disciples of previous abbots). As Schlütter argues, this system was far more subject to state control, with officials initiating the search, convening a search committee of local abbots, appealing to other officials to permit the candidate to leave a different monastery, and finally appointing the candidate. In some cases, these appointments were made by the emperor himself.[119]

---

[117] Schlütter provides a clear overview of the primarily Japanese scholarship on this phenomenon in his "Vinaya Monasteries, Public Abbacies, and State Control of Buddhism Under the Song Dynasty (960–1279)." He also contributes his own research on the topic, drawing in particular on Song legal and monastic codes.

[118] Translated by Halperin, *Out of the Cloister*, 62.

[119] Schlütter suggests that the first Tiantai designation of a public monastery may have been the result of petitions by Zhili and Yiwen in 1010 ("Vinaya Monasteries, Public Abbacies, and State Control of Buddhism under the Song (960–1279)," 150).

To complicate matters, most of the public monasteries seem to have been associated with a specific tradition of Buddhism, and their abbacies were open only to those prominent monks from other monasteries who shared that affiliation. As Schlütter notes, to start with, public monasteries were probably all identified with Chan, but early in the Song some monasteries were designated as Tiantai, thanks to the efforts of Tiantai monks who agitated to share this privilege. In such a situation, lineage took on a new role as a credential for leadership. Curiously enough, though, as the work of Foulk and Sharf on portraits has shown, the line of succession of abbots sometimes competed with and was sometimes grafted to that of patriarchs.[120]

Conclusion

Over the course of the seventh to tenth centuries, Chan lineage proved malleable enough to express different religious messages, e.g., the refutation of a decline in Buddhism, the superiority of a particular line of masters, the assertion of a supreme and silent teaching, and the unity and splendor of a great clan of sages. At times it took advantage of the obscurity of some figures to attribute to them an importance (and then elaborate life stories and teachings) that no longer needed to be secret. At other times it took advantage of well-known figures to anchor the lineage in their eminence and reputation. It also lent itself to multiple strategic and political purposes: denying the teachings of others, promoting a new form of Chinese Buddhism, and securing the abbacy of a prominent public monastery.

Qisong, to whom we turn next, did not know this history. He knew a Buddhism dominated by schools and lineages, and Chan lineage played a significant role in his personal and intellectual career. In the following chapters, we will see him enter a world organized by lineage, confront a welter of conflicting sources on lineage, and contribute to the next stage of construction and defense of Chan lineage.

[120] "On the Ritual Use of Ch'an Portraiture," 179–81.

PART TWO

THE LIFE OF QISONG

CHAPTER THREE

THE LIFE OF QISONG

Introduction

Qisong was born in the far south, on the periphery of Chinese civilization at the time. By the time of his death in Lin'an 臨安, now Hangzhou, in his mid-sixties, he had been named an heir to an influential branch of Chan lineage and made a name for himself as a writer and scholar. In this chapter, we will follow the dramatic arc of Qisong's life, to his journey from obscurity at the edges of the empire to fame and triumph at its center.

Historical material generally reaches us through a few highly predictable patterns of preservation. The elite are usually represented, especially those who live long enough to make a mark in the world, those who are intent on being remembered, and those who are respected by or useful to later generations. Sheer chance also plays a role, wiping out some legacies and preserving others against all odds. In the case of Qisong, many of these forces were at work. Over his long life, he wrote prolifically and well, winning the approbation and friendship of many highly-placed officials and fellow monks. In his mid-fifties, he also devoted himself to securing the acceptance of several of his most important works in the imperial canon. In addition, roughly half of his other writings survive, thanks to the efforts of the monk Huaiwu 懷悟 (fl. 1107–1134), whose respect for Qisong prompted him to persevere—over a period of over two decades that included the disruption caused by the fall of the Northern Song—in gathering Qisong's printed writings and taking rubbings of those preserved as stone inscriptions.[1]

[1] Huaiwu details his efforts to collect Qisong's writings in a postscript to the *Tanjin wenji* 鐔津文集 [T.52.2115, hereafter, *Collected Works*]. He began the arduous task before 1107–1110 and continued until 1134. He calculates that he amassed roughly 300,000 of the 600,000 words Qisong is said to have written (*Collected Works*, 746b–747a). Huaiwu seems to have had a taste for this sort of work because, according to the thirteenth-century historian Zhipan 志磐, he was also involved in collating a more complete version of the *Mt. Lu shiba xian zhuan* 廬山十八仙傳 (*Fozu tongji*

Despite the abundance of writings by Qisong, scholarly treatment of him has never been thorough and consistent. The reason for this lies in part in the varied nature of his writings and the many different conversations and identities in which he took part. Qisong wrote essays on Confucian topics, rejoinders to Confucian anti-Buddhist rhetoric, and poetry as well as a set of works explaining and defending Chan lineage. He was a Buddhist monk who revered Confucius and energetically defended Buddhism against Confucian critics; he was also a Chan dharma heir who responded forcefully to Tiantai critics of Chan lineage.

Since for many scholars, Qisong has been only one piece of a larger puzzle, he has often been addressed in passing, with attention only to one portion of his varied writings. Few have gone beyond the main biographical source on Qisong, the account of his life written shortly after his death by a friend, the official Chen Shunyu 陳舜俞 (d. 1074).[2] A more thorough study of Qisong's life is worthwhile, however, not only because it provides a context for his various writings but also because Qisong, for all that he was unusually accomplished, was in many ways also representative of his era and of monastic Chinese Buddhism at that time.

The trajectory of Qisong's life confirms, for example, the possibility of rising to fame by means of talent rather than family connections. Like a number of peers among the literati elite, he and some of his contemporaries rose to eminence in the sangha despite humble origins at the margins of the empire.[3] The success of such monks suggests

佛祖統記, T.49.2035, 268c20–25). No one else seems to have taken such care with information about Huaiwu; he is otherwise absent from the historical record.

[2] This short piece, "Mingjiao dashi xingye ji" 明教大師行業記, is preserved both in Chen's collected work, *Duguan ji* 都管集, and at the beginning of Qisong's *Collected Works*, 648a–c. An interlineal annotation on the latter notes that the original was carved in stone at the Lingyin Monastery, presumably at the spot where Qisong's śarīra were placed in a stūpa. On Chen Shunyu himself, see the biography in the *Songshi* (30.331.10663) and Florian Caspar Reiter, "Der 'Bericht ober den Berg Lu' (Lu-shan chi) von Ch'en Shun-yu," 1–8. Halperin describes Chen as a "T'ien-t'ai stalwart" critical of Chan, a characterization called into question by his association with Qisong, who did not hesitate to attack Tiantai critics of Chan lineage (*Out of the Cloister*, 91).

[3] A comprehensive study of the social, economic, and educational backgrounds of Chinese Buddhist monastics has yet to be done—and may be impossible, given the dearth of personal information in much Buddhist hagiographical material—so a parallel between officials and monks of humble origins achieving elite status during the Song must remain speculative. (On examination success and the achievement of offi-

both the openness of the Buddhist monastic establishment, at least to men of demonstrable talent, and the intellectual and social possibilities created by the freedom of monks to travel and study without economic encumbrance.

We may also ask if Qisong is representative of the Chan school, for his life and works challenge a number of common assumptions about Chan. A few scholars, most notably Faure, Foulk, and Schlütter have demonstrated that the Chan school and its members had far more in common with—and were in fact less separate from—the rest of Chinese Buddhism than its rhetoric—and scholars who have taken this rhetoric at something close to face value—would lead us to believe.[4] In describing tensions within Chan self-understanding, Robert Gimello writes of the other side of a school often considered radical, of "Ch'an as the conscientious husbander of a commodious Buddhist orthodoxy, as the reverent guardian of learned tradition, and as the generous sponsor of ever more expansive and accommodating designs of the path."[5] A close examination of Qisong's life and work offers a window into this traditionalist side of Chan. It also suggests that certain practices and beliefs supposedly characteristic of Chan were themselves neither monolithic nor always in evidence among Chan dharma heirs.

---

cial position in the Song, see John Chaffee's introduction to the second edition of his *The Thorny Gates of Learning in Sung China* for an overview of recent scholarship about whether the examination system of the period fostered or prevented the rise of candidates from families without previous success in the examinations.) Timothy Brook's assertion in *Praying for Power* that few member of elite society became monks until the late Ming has been questioned by Anthony DeBlasi ("A Parallel World: A Case Study of Monastic Society, Northern Song to Ming," 163–4) and indirectly by the research of Chen Jinhua, who has emphasized the importance of family connections for a number of leading medieval monastics (*Monks and monarchs, kinship and kingship: Tanqian in Sui Buddhism and politics*).

[4] In *The Rhetoric of Immediacy*, Faure showcases the magical, uncanny side of Chan, while Foulk devotes his 1987 Univ. of Michigan dissertation to undermining the myth of a self-conscious and institutionally autonomous Chan school in the Tang. In terms of individuals, Schlütter has argued that "the only clearly defining characteristic of a Song Chan master is that he or she was recognized as holding a transmission in the Chan lineage" (*How Zen Became Zen*, 15). In much the same vein, Foulk has described as the possession of the "regalia" of transmission, like an inheritance certificate plus "a familiarity with the mythology of Ch'an and an ability to mimic its rhetorical style in certain ritual settings" ("Myth, Ritual, and Monastic Practice," 161), but many scholars have expected Chan masters to differ from other Buddhists far more dramatically in their teachings and practices.

[5] "Mārga and Culture: Learning, Letters, and Liberation in Northern Sung Ch'an," 377. See also Jeffrey Broughton's comments on Zongmi as a representative of the 'other side' of Chan tradition (*Zongmi on Chan*, 1–3).

The study of Qisong's life in this and the following chapter indicates that the Chan school of his day not only tolerated but celebrated a monk-scholar who in no way fit the mold of the Chan master presented in classic Chan works of the period. To begin with, despite his excellent Chan pedigree, Qisong confounds any expectations that a Chan master speak enigmatically and behave unpredictably. We have no stories of students achieving awakening in response to a word or blow from him.[6] Indeed, because Qisong had neither disciples who succeeded in continuing his line nor the cachet to inspire later generations to invent claims of affiliation, the story of his life has not been subjected to much hagiographical elaboration, nor have 'recording sayings' been created for him.

A survey of Qisong's work suggests that two of the elements of Chan most valued by practitioners and considered most distinctive by scholars, lineage and a literature of lively 'recorded sayings' or 'public cases' (rather than of stodgy sutra and commentary), need not be joined. While greatly concerned with lineage, Qisong did not spend much time rejecting or even playing with language; although reckoned a very good poet, most of his corpus is clear straightforward prose admired by advocates of the *guwen* style based on the Confucian classics. In such language, Qisong devotes himself neither to recounting the lives of past Chan masters nor to collecting or commenting on 'public cases' but to historical and philosophical argument. Qisong's life also raises questions about the significance and nature of membership in a particular branch of Chan lineage during the Northern Song. Many scholars who dismiss traditional claims of mind-to-mind transmission as mystical nonsense assume that belonging to a branch or 'house' of Chan such as Linji or Yunmen did serve to determine a monk's intellectual identity.[7] Through Qisong's extensive writings on lineage and a detailed account of his life, we may explore what it meant to one monk, both intellectually and practically, to belong to one branch of Chan lineage.[8] That exploration reveals that, at least for the eleventh century,

---

[6] On the wild speech and behavior of Chan masters, see Foulk's useful comments on putting them into context and into comparative perspective ("Myth, Ritual, and Monastic Practice," 178–9).

[7] Some scholars avoid this assumption without comment, but Schlütter offers a history of the five-house schema, arguing that it had little real significance before the twelfth century (*How Zen Became Zen*, 9, 20–25, 181–2).

[8] Foulk also makes the important point that "Chan lineage" is "essentially a mythological entity," but in addition he explains that because of the enactment of this

we must be clear that to identify a monk as Linji, Fayan or Yunmen is to refer to his religious genealogy, and in most cases to identify the religious genealogy of many of his closest associates, but it does not necessarily tell us very much about his intellectual interests or religious practices and experiences.

An answer to the question "What sort of Chan master is Qisong?" may, I believe, force us to broaden our vision of the Chan school. Given that most of Qisong's philosophical writings focus on the compatibility of Buddhist and *ru*, or Confucian, thought, we must also ask, as did some of his peers, what sort of Buddhist he was. His view of a Buddhist world with ample room and respect for 'sages' other than the Buddha requires us to reconsider sectarian identity among Chinese Buddhists. Gimello has offered a compelling picture of the Northern Song as a time when Buddhism "could venture outside the monastery and take its public place in the larger world," and Qisong is a prime example in terms of his engagement with the Confucian revival of the eleventh century.[9] Qisong's willingness to disregard sectarian identities in order to pursue underlying commonalities between Buddhism and Confucianism has made him an ancestor of sorts for the *sanjiao* 三教, or 'three teachings' movement 'unifying' the three elite traditions in Chinese religion. Qisong may in some ways be a monastic Buddhist parallel to Chao Jiong 晁迥 (951–1034), a prominent early Song official about whom Gimello has written. Chao's education spanned *ru* classics, Daoist texts, and Buddhist literature, and he wrote explicitly about harmonizing the three teachings while also holding Buddhism up as the highest of these teachings. Gimello describes this attitude as one of "faithful liberality or conciliatory orthodoxy" which "allows him to accord ultimacy to Buddhism without prohibiting his acknowledgment of the special genius, the particular relevance, and even the necessity of the other traditions that he also esteems."[10] Qisong certainly held this attitude toward Confucianism. At the same time, he was zealous in his defense of Chan lineage against other Buddhists, which raises questions about what lies behind his complex loyalties.

---

mythology, it did "possess a certain social and institutional reality" ("Myth, Ritual, and Monastic Practice," 159).

[9] "Mārga and Culture," 377–80.

[10] "Notes on the Relationship Between T'ien-t'ai Buddhism and Northern Sung Literati Culture," 14.

The following account of Qisong's life allows us to assemble his various interests and allegiances into a single narrative and to identify a single impulse motivating his varied activities. That motive, I argue, is reverence for those figures he takes to be his spiritual ancestors, and it prompted him not only to make sure that they are remembered but to defend them against those who misunderstand or fail to recognize them. Indeed, it is this traditionalist reverence that inspires his creative engagement with and re-imagining of his tradition(s). At the same time, curiously enough, Qisong seems to have lived his own life without significant influence from a living teacher and without devoting himself to face-to-face teaching. He connected most deeply with the sages known to him through writing, and he defended them the same way.

This account also makes clear how very much Qisong was a man of his times. His experiences and attitudes grew directly out of the ascendency of Chan in the early Song—and the self-understanding in terms of lineage key to that rise. Tiantai resistance to Chan predominance and lineage struck him as profoundly misguided, as did the anti-Buddhist polemic of the nascent Confucian revival movement, even as he responded enthusiastically to the same movement's call to return to the Confucian classics.

Early Years

Thanks to Qisong's eminence and residence at the famed Lingyin Monastery 靈隐寺 near Hangzhou, we know to the day the date of his death: June 22, 1072. He was reported to have lived sixty-six *sui*, fifty-three of them as a monk.[11] Thus we may date his birth to 1007.[12] He

[11] Chen Shunyu provides this date. In his 1119 *Chanlin sengbao zhuan* 禪林僧寶傳, Juefan Huihong 覺範慧洪 (1071–1128) gives Qisong's time of death as midnight (ZZ 2b.10.3, 273d16). In this case, as in others, Huihong presents material not found in Chen's account without identifying a source. He may simply have been suggesting a parallel to the Buddha, whose death is also reported to have occurred at midnight. Makita Tairyō 牧田諦亮 notes that a number of later texts, the *Jianzhong jingguo xu denglu* 建中靖國續燈錄, *Fozu tongji* 佛祖統記, and *Wudeng huiyuan* 五燈會元 mistakenly give the year of Qisong's death as 1071 (Xining 熙寧 4) rather than the following year (*Chūgoku kinsei Bukkyōshi no kenkyū*, 167, n. 32).

[12] The Chinese way of calculating age, i.e., adding a year at every lunar new year, generally results in an age a year older that that figured according to the Western method. Thus Qisong had lived sixty-five full years at death. Makita sometimes gives Qisong's birthdate as 1011 (*Chūgoku kinsei Bukkyōshi no kenkyū*, 145). Huang Min-chih

was born in the south, in what is now the Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region. As the current bureaucratic place name suggests, this area has long had a significant non-Han population, including many Zhuang 壯 people.[13] As part of the incorporation of the area into the Chinese state, the government began moving Han Chinese there as early as the reign of the first Qin 秦 emperor (221–210 BCE), but the distinctive customs of its non-Han population and location in the far south meant that those in central China had long regarded the area as not quite Chinese.[14] Indeed, the deep south, including Guangxi, was considered by those in central China to be neither civilized nor healthful; many emperors chose to exile those in deep disfavor there, expecting the journey and endemic diseases like malaria to take their toll and the uncouth society to serve as punishment.[15] Despite this marginal location, the little we know of Qisong's family, who were almost certainly Han, suggests that they shared the assumptions and aspirations of mainstream elite Chinese culture.

Qisong's friend and biographer Chen Shunyu describes Qisong's early life only in terms of the milestones of his monastic career, but Qisong, in the preface to an essay on filial piety, gave an outline of his domestic situation.[16] The family, surnamed Li 李, lived in Tanjin 鐔津 in Tengzhou 藤州 prefecture, not far from Wuzhou 梧洲, still

---

黃敏枝 also gives this date in her *Song Yuan Fojiao shehui jingji shi lunji*, 8, 11). She does not cite Makita, however, which suggests that there may be another, earlier source for the date. I have not found it, however, and since Makita also gives the date 1007 at times (as in the lineage chart, 148), perhaps it is a simple error, repeated by Huang. Jan Yün-hua repeated this date in his *Sung Biographies* entry on Qisong, which has led to its repetition in Western scholarship.

[13] Until twentieth-century political concerns with unifying all ethnic groups arose, the name of this ethnic group was written with a character meaning 'wild dogs,' 獞. (Before the current character was adopted, there was an intermediate stage when 僮 was used.)

[14] For an analysis of the political and military position of Guangxi in the Song, see Winston L. Lo 羅文, "Songdai 'qianggan ruozhi' zhengce shishi zhi yipie."

[15] A few of the most famous cases include Han Yu 韓愈 (768–824), who was twice exiled to the south, Su Shi 蘇軾 (1036–1101), who was sent successively farther and farther south and who took care to made preparations for his funeral and burial before the last of these journeys, and Huang Tingjian 黃庭堅 (1045–1105), who expired while exiled in Guangxi. See, respectively, Charles Hartman, *Han Yü and the T'ang Search for Unity*, 57–60, 84–99; George C. Hatch, "Su Shih" in *Sung Biographies*, v. 3, 965–6; and Mark Halperin, *Out of the Cloister: Literati Perspectives on Buddhism in Sung China, 960–1279*, 1–2. For a discussion of the phenomenon of exile to the south, especially the Xiao Xiang area (modern Hunan), see Alfreda Murck, *Poetry and Painting in Song China: The Subtle Art of Dissent*, chap. 1.

[16] "Xiao lun" 孝論, *Collected Works*, 660a–b.

an important city near the border between Guangxi and Guangdong.[17] When Qisong's father was dying, he decided to send his son, then seven *sui*, to a local monastery. We can only speculate on his motives. Andō has suggested that financial pressure related to the illness and anticipated death of Qisong's father prompted the decision.[18] It is also possible that his father hoped that dedicating a son to a monastic life would either save his own life or improve his fate after death. Alternatively, his father may have considered a monastic life his son's best opportunity for education or security.

At some point after Qisong's father died and Qisong had moved to a nearby monastery, his older brothers, or possibly older Li cousins, argued that the boy, who was beginning to show some skill as a student, should be brought back home to prepare for civil service examinations.[19] This tells us little about the status or history of the family as this was a moment in early Song history when more and more families of varied backgrounds aspired to civil service careers for their sons.[20] Qisong reports that his mother, whom, as with so many women of this era, we know only by her family name, which was Zhong 鍾, objected, saying, "It was his father's command. It cannot be altered."[21] Qisong went on to become a novice at thirteen *sui* and receive full precepts at fourteen *sui*.[22] The family dispute over Qisong replayed itself again when, at nineteen *sui*, he expressed a desire to leave his hometown and travel freely, as was common for young monks. His relatives detained him until his mother overruled them, saying to her son, "You already

[17] For Qisong's hometown, some Western-language sources give an alternative pronunciation of Xinjin. Since the most recent scholarship on place names, the *Zhonghua renmin gongheguo da diming cidian*, has not yet published a volume on Guangxi, I follow Aoyama Sadao 青山定雄, *Dokushi hōyo kiyō sakuin Shina rekidai chimei yōran* 讀史方與紀要索引支那歷代地名要覽, which draws on Song-era sources, and the *Zhongguo lishi diming da cidian* 中國歷史地名大辭典, ed. Wei Songshan 魏嵩山.

[18] "Butsunichi Meikyo Kaisū shikō," 94–5.

[19] To appreciate the context for this ambition, consider that, according to a table John Chaffee assembled to show prefectural and circuit distribution of *jinshi* 進士, or presented scholars, in the Song, Wuzhou prefecture produced only three *jinshi* during the whole of the Northern Song (*Thorny Gates of Learning*, 199).

[20] Pei-Yi Wu, "Education of Children in the Sung," 308.

[21] *Collected Works*, 660a29.

[22] The monastic code permits full ordination only at 20, but early ordination seems to have been quite common.

follow the Buddha. To focus your efforts on that path is proper. How could [we] bind you with affection? Go."[23]

This account, read in terms of narrative tropes, owes as much to the classic Confucian model of a virtuous widow and mother who remains loyal to the (in this case, Buddhist) wishes of her late husband as it does to the familiar East Asian Buddhist hagiographical narrative of overcoming familial resistance to a monastic vocation. As a result of this interweaving of filial obedience and Buddhist renunciation, Qisong professed profound gratitude to his parents, especially his mother, who "brought my path to completion."[24] He never returned to his hometown, although he kept up some contact with his family.[25] Unable to tend the graves of his parents or repair the damage done at one point by grave robbers, he expressed his feeling toward his parents—and generated merit on their behalf—by writing the essay on *xiao* 孝, or filial devotion, from which all our knowledge about his family and early life is gleaned, an essay intended to "illuminate the mysterious principle and secret meaning of our great sage's [i.e., the Buddha's] great filial devotion, converging with the theories of *ru* scholars."[26]

This account of Qisong's early life raises many questions, few of which can be answered. What sort of life, one wonders, did he lead at the monastery? What sort of education did he receive? On the basis of Dunhuang documents bearing the writing exercises of young monastery dwellers, Erik Zürcher has argued that in the Tang the education of young boys in monasteries consisted of learning to read and write by means of standard 'secular' texts supplemented, as the student advanced, by Buddhist texts.[27] Unfortunately, although Qisong did receive enough education to demonstrate a talent for learning, thus

---

[23] *Collected Works*, 660b2–3. I have consulted Araki Kengo's translation in *Fuhyōben*, 192–5.

[24] *Collected Works*, 660b3–4.

[25] See, for example, "Song Xunyang Yao Jiabu shu" 送潯陽姚駕部叔 (*Collected Works*, 707a–b), a 1062 letter to a Mr. Yao in which Qisong mentions a letter passed to an uncle living at home. A sister's son also became a monk and attended Qisong near the end of his life (*Collected Works*, 746a16–17).

[26] *Collected Works*, 660b9–10.

[27] "Buddhism and Education in T'ang Times" in *Neo-Confucian Education: The Formative Stage*, eds. Wm. Theodore de Bary and John W. Chaffee (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1989), 19–56, esp. 35–39. For a later account which illustrates well how classical education was sometimes advanced by Buddhist monks, see the story of Luo Shi (1029–1101), an official who received an education in the classics from two monks in his hometown (Halperin, *Out of the Cloister*, 216–8).

attracting the notice and raising the hopes of his relations, he provides no information about this aspect of his early life. A few scholars have assumed that Qisong did not receive any significant education while in Guangxi; one notes that an official who supervised the area in the late 1020s was the first to establish government-supported schools, no doubt as part of the widespread support of state schools under Renzong 仁宗 (r. 1022-1063).[28] But one need not attend formal schools to learn, and a note attached to one of his works by an admirer asserts that Qisong studied Confucian texts as a young man.[29]

Qisong also neglects almost entirely to tell us anything about the monks who supervised and ordained him or the monastery where he lived for over a decade. One tantalizing reference to his first 'good friend' 善知識, or *kalyāṇa-mitra*, telling him something about one of Bodhidharma's disciples has survived.[30] Although Chan developed mainly in the central and coastal provinces of China, a number of important Chan monks did travel and live in the far south, including Yunmen Wenyan 雲門文偃 (864–949), for whom the branch of Chan lineage in which Qisong would receive dharma transmission is named. Ultimately, however, we have only this slender reed upon which to speculate about what sort of monastic education or sectarian leanings, if any, he may have been exposed to in his early years.

Qisong's interaction with his family also raises general questions about the relationship between boys in monasteries and their families. How far did familial authority extend into the monastery? Were his relations supporting him financially in his life there, directly or indirectly? In Qisong's account, he, his mother, and other relatives all took part in the struggle over his future, but we hear no voice of monastic authority calling for Qisong to continue in the monastery or to go traveling. Since he composed the piece to express gratitude toward his parents, this might be a deliberate choice to emphasize their role, but

---

[28] Jan calls Qisong self-educated ("Ch'i-sung," 186–7) while Huang Chi-chiang assumes a lack of early education ("Experiment in Syncretism," 143–4). See Thomas H.C. Lee on Renzong's education policies (*Government Education and Examinations in Sung China*, 107).

[29] T.51.2077.716a25. Unfortunately, this note is dated 1174, and it is impossible to determine whether it reflects a tradition of knowledge about Qisong's early life that is now lost or is simply the author's opinion based on his reading of the text in question. Abe Chōichi asserts that Qisong studied Confucian texts from an early age, and this may be his source (*Chūgoku Zenshūshi no kenkyū* 中国禅宗史の研究, 231).

[30] *Critical Essay* T.51.2080.782a3. His teacher repeats a line known from the *Jingde Record*.

nowhere in his extant writings does Qisong recall an early teacher or ordination master. As we will see, this is only the first in a pattern of striking absences in records of his earlier years. It may well be that Qisong preferred remote ancestors, ancestors at a distance, to actual authority figures close at hand.

The Journey North

When he left his hometown in 1025 or so, Qisong traveled north along the Xi 西 river, past Guizhou 桂州 (modern Guilin), to the Xiang 湘 river, which he followed northeast through Hunan. His biographer Chen tells us that Qisong carried an image of Guanyin on his head while chanting the name of the bodhisattva one hundred thousand times daily. While Qisong would have been in keeping with tradition to try to avert disasters on the road in this way, Chen and a series of later biographers credit this practice not with Qisong's protection from harm but with his ability to "master, without studying, the classics of the world."[31]

Qisong himself recorded a few vivid anecdotes of his travels. In one, he had just begun traveling when he came to the house of an elderly *daogu* 道姑, or "nun of the Way." She was an unusual woman who, when young, was drawing water from a stream when she felt "dragon spittle" on her body. At sundown, "dragon light" filled her room. She "died and then returned to life." No longer enjoying life at home, she went to "live a pure life" in the mountains, where she chanted the Buddhist texts she had received from a "divine monk" who had ridden through the air to come visit her. One night at her house, Qisong heard a sound like a big bell ringing. The sound came from a pond on the side of the mountain. Deciding that it did not really sound like a bell, Qisong asked the nun about the sound. She replied that he had heard the roar of a dragon, explaining that to hear it was highly

[31] *Collected Works*, 648b1–2. Although it is unclear what sort of image Qisong possessed, whether a drawing or statue, Guanyin in male or female form, an apotropaic use of Guanyin has many antecedents. See Chün-fang Yü, *Kuan-yin: The Chinese Transformation of Avalokiteśvara*, esp. chap. 4. Avalokiteśvara is associated with the prevention of disasters, and travelers, most famously Xuanzang, have long called on this bodhisattva for protection.

The *Jianzhong jingguo xu denglu* understands Qisong to be saluting or paying respects to Guanyin, not carrying the image (ZZ 2b.9.9, 50b).

auspicious and predicting that things would later go well for him. Having read of such encounters with dragons, including that of a man who later became prime minister, Qisong was impressed by the nun's own experience, but he reports having difficulty overcoming both his empirical doubts and his humility.[32]

North of Tanzhou 潭州 (modern Changsha), Qisong visited Mt. Shending 神鼎山, where he met Shending Hongyin 神鼎洪諲, a master in the Linji branch of Chan lineage.[33] Qisong himself mentions the encounter nowhere, but Juefan Huihong 覺範慧洪 (1071-1128) offers two differing accounts in his *Chanlin sengbao zhuan* 禪林僧寶傳. In his entry on Qisong, Huihong reports that the two spoke and that Hongyin marveled at Qisong. But Qisong achieved no awakening, and so he traveled on.[34] In Huihong's account of Hongyin, he tells a rather different story. The young Qisong visits Hongyin's monastery only to be insulted by Hongyin in classic Chan fashion. When Qisong arrives, Hongyin accuses him of having come merely for the food.[35]

Qisong next traveled northeast overland into Jiangxi. He came to Yunzhou 筠州, where, northwest of Gaoan 高安, at Mt. Dong 洞山, Dongshan Xiaocong 洞山曉聡 (d. 1030), a third-generation dharma heir of Yunmen Wenyan, had been serving as abbot at Qixian Monastery 栖賢寺 since 1009.[36] Xiaocong was one of the most prestigious Yunmen masters of the day. Given Qisong's later acceptance as one of

---

[32] "Ji longming" 記龍鳴 (*Collected Works*, 685c–686a).

[33] Hongyin came from Huaishui (in modern Anhui, just northwest of Nanjing) and became the dharma heir of Shoushan Shengnian 首山省念 (926–993). Yanagida has identified Shengnian as the "real" founder of the Linji lineage ("Goroku no rekishi," 568), and Albert Welter discusses the role he and his students played in the creation of the *Linji lu* (*The* Linji li *and the Creation of Chan Orthodoxy*, esp. chap. 4).

[34] Huihong writes that there was no *qiwu* 契悟 (*Chanlin sengbao zhuan*, ZZ 2b.10.3, 273c15-16), which Ogisu Jundō interprets as a lack of karmic bond ("Gohō no zensha Butsunichi Kaisū," 75), but given the appearance of this term in the *Platform Sutra* and elsewhere to mean an awakening as well as Nakamura Hajime's reading of the term in his *Bukkyōgo daijiten* (167), I have taken this meaning as primary. Of course, in this situation the two meanings are highly interconnected.

[35] *Chanlin sengbao zhuan*, ZZ 2b.10.3, 249a–b. Huihong, like Zhipan, often suppresses or omits critical comments from a person's biography, only to provide them in another related biography or, in the case of Zhipan, a section of general history.

[36] Huihong is the only source for Xiaocong's service as abbot of Qixian Monastery (*Chanlin sengbao zhuan*, ZZ 2b.10.3, 243c16–d2) and death date of July 18, 1030 (*Chanlin sengbao zhuan*, ZZ 2b.10.3, 244a4–8). NB: Due to a confusion of this Yunzhou with another in Sichuan, in modern scholarship Qisong has sometimes mistakenly been described as meeting Xiaocong in Sichuan, with Xiaocong mistakenly taken to be a native of Sichuan.

Xiaocong's dharma heirs within the wider network of Yunmen lineage members, there is no doubt that Qisong did become Xiaocong's heir, and yet we know nothing about their interaction from Qisong or from other sources. We do not even know if Qisong remained with Xiaocong until the latter's death in 1030 or if Qisong had by that time already moved on. Given Qisong's insistence on the centrality of dharma transmission, this is an intriguing omission.[37]

The records that remain of Xiaocong's encounters with students do not mention Qisong, nor do they give any hint of a resemblance between the two. It is impossible to know whether Xiaocong had any influence on Qisong, when as far as we know the most they share is something as commonplace as a fondness for the *Diamond Sutra*.[38] In most accounts, Xiaocong is described as a paradigmatic Chan master, leading his students to moments of realization through conversation and action. Huihong, for example, emphasizes that "hearing one word, one knew he was a descendent of Yunmen."[39]

Seemingly unnoticed by either traditional or modern biographers, however, is the possibility of a regional connection between Xiaocong and Qisong, both of whom were from the far south. According to Huihong, Xiaocong came from Qujiang 曲江 in Shaozhou 韶州 (modern Shaoguan 韶關 in Guangdong), said to be the site of Huineng's initial awakening and later preaching;[40] this city is just under 375 kilometers, or less than 250 miles, from Qisong's hometown.[41] Xiaocong began his monastic career near his hometown, at Yunmen Monastery, founded by Yunmen Wenyan himself.[42] Given Qisong's attachment to the south and the way he later consistently sought out fellow southerners and officials who had served in the south, he may very well have felt an affinity for Xiaocong.

---

[37] Andō also noticed this omission and promised to comment at a later date, but he has not continued this inquiry ("Butsunichi Meikyo Kaisū shikō," 102). See Steven Heine's "Did Dōgen Go to China? Problematizing Dōgen's Relation to Ju-ching and Chinese Ch'an" for a thought-provoking look at another master-disciple relationship.

[38] In *Tō Godai no Zenshū* 唐五代の禅宗, Suzuki Tetsuo 鈴木哲雄 cites an inscription that mentions Xiaocong reciting the *Diamond Sutra* (287–88). In his 1107 *Linjian lu* 林間錄, Huihong writes that Qisong was old, he recited the *Diamond Sutra* daily at dawn (ZZ 2b.10.3, 307d5).

[39] *Linjian lu*, ZZ 2b.10.3, 321a–b.

[40] Jorgensen, *Inventing Hui-neng*, 521–26.

[41] XZJ 79.1560.514a15.

[42] For a description of a recent visit to Yunmen Monastery, see Urs App, *Master Yunmen*, xi–xv.

It is also possible that Qisong refrains from discussing his master precisely because it was an intimate and private connection. However, Xiaocong's complete absence from Qisong's writings, aside from his listing in the Chan genealogy Qisong compiled, suggests otherwise. Was this perhaps the sort of strategic transmission—to a promising young monk who is passing through—that Holmes Welch describes among early twentieth-century Chinese Buddhists?[43] Qisong's lack of contact with his 'dharma brothers,' Xiaocong's other dharma heirs, who appear nowhere in his writings or correspondence, suggests that Qisong did not stay long or develop lasting relationships in Xiaocong's community.

We do not know when Qisong left Qixian Monastery. Even if he remained there with Xiaocong until the latter's death in 1030, Qisong would have been just 23 *sui*. Nevertheless, after this point in his life, Qisong identifies no one as his teacher. His relationships are with those he considers his peers. He expresses admiration for certain older monks, but he seems to take them as models of Buddhist understanding rather than his own personal teachers.[44]

Learning at Mt. Lu

The historical record next places Qisong at Mt. Xi 西山, a good distance east of Mt. Dong but still in Jiangxi province. At some time in the Mingdao 明道 era (1032–34), we are told, Qisong borrowed books from one Ouyang Fang 歐陽昉, who lived at Mt. Xi, and read them in a local temple.[45]

Qisong next traveled north to Mt. Lu 廬山, in the far north of Jiangxi. Mt. Lu stands just southeast of the city of Jiujiang 九江 and

[43] "Dharma Scrolls and the Succession of Abbots in Chinese Monasteries," 117. Consider also McRae's comments on the relationship between Hongren and Shenhui (*Seeing Through Zen*, 68).

[44] Here I have in mind Master Zhen of Mt. Lu and the Xiuzhou masters to be discussed below.

[45] Our source for this information is *Luohu yelu* 羅湖野錄 (ZZ 2b.15.5, 484d12–13), written in the mid-twelfth century by Zhongwen Xiaoying 仲溫曉瑩, a disciple of Dahui Zonggao, who lived in Fengcheng 豐城, not far to the south of Xishan. Wei Daoru extends the Mingdao dating to the following phrase about writing the "Yuanjiao," but the evidence is against this reading (Du Jiwen 杜繼文 and Wei Daoru 魏道儒, *Zhongguo chanzong tongshi* 中國禪宗通史, 404). For the *Luohu yelu*, see Ono, v. 11, 166; Chen Yuan, 143–5; and Chan Hing-ho, "Lo-hu yeh-lu" in *Sung Bibliography*, 355–6.

just west of Lake Poyang 鄱陽湖. The fourth-century *Baopuzi* 抱朴子 names this mountain one of a set of mountains conducive to "mental concentration and the preparation of drugs of immortality," and Zürcher contends that the redoubtable Buddhist scholar and practitioner Huiyuan (334–416) chose to settle there in part because of this reputation.[46] By the Northern Song, Mt. Lu was the site of numerous monasteries and a major center of Buddhist and Daoist activity.[47] In his account of Qisong's life, Chen Shenyu mentions Mt. Lu only in passing, but Qisong seems to have spent a significant length of time at Mt. Lu and to have later thought of returning.[48]

Andō attributes Qisong's decision to go to Mt. Lu to its physical beauty, a circle of amenable literati, and contact with Huiyuan's legacy.[49] To that, we must add that Mt. Lu was a center of Chan, including Yunmen, activity. Many Yunmen monks spent time there and developed lasting ties to others in their branch of Chan lineage. For instance, the eminent Yuantong Ju'ne 圓通居訥 (1010–1071), originally from Sichuan, spent a decade at Mt. Dong (where Qisong had met his master Xiaocong), received dharma transmission from a Yunmen master there, and then traveled to Mt. Lu.[50] He soon became

[46] *The Buddhist Conquest of China*, 207–8. See also the comments of James Robson in "Monastic Spaces and Sacred Traces: Facets of Chinese Buddhist Monastic Records."

[47] Mt. Lu was also important in the Song revival of Confucianism, as the famed White Deer Grotto School was located there. This school was founded during the Five Dynasties and received some imperial attention and support in the early Song. After falling on hard times, it was abandoned for most of the eleventh and twelfth centuries until Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200) revived it in 1179–81. See John Chaffee, "Chu Hsi and the Revival of the White Deer Grotto Academy, 1179–81 AD." Abe Chōichi has also written on religious interactions on Mt. Lu during the Song ("Sōdai no Rozan" 宋代の廬山).

[48] Qisong expressed a wish to return in his elegy for Zhou Shuzhi (*Collected Works*, 718b20) and a letter to Master Zhen (*Collected Works*, 709b27–29). Chen's oversight is particularly curious, given that, after being exiled to Mt. Lu in 1072 for criticism of Wang Anshi's policies, he wrote a lengthy history of Mt. Lu, the *Lushan ji* (T.51.2095), just a few years before he wrote Qisong's biography. See Florian Reiter, "Der 'Bericht ober den Berg Lu' (Lu-shan chi)" and "Bergmonographien als geographische und historische Quellen, dargestellt an Ch'en Shun-yüs 'Bericht über den Berg Lu' (*Lu-shan chi*) aus dem 11 Jahrhundert," 397–407. Koichi Shinohara has also written "Literary Construction of Buddhist Sacred Places: *The Record of Mt. Lu* by Chen Shunyu."

[49] Andō, 101. While I will suggest some other possible reasons, a piece Qisong wrote for Huiyuan's portrait hall confirms that the connection to Huiyuan appealed to Qisong (*Collected Works*, 719a–b).

[50] *Xu chuandeng lu*, T.51.2077.504c. In modern Chinese, the character 訥 may be pronounced 'ne' or 'na.' As the *Hanyu da cidian* gives the former only, I have used it. Due to differing accounts of when Ju'ne went to Mt. Lu, it is unclear whether Qisong and Ju'ne might have crossed paths at Dongshan. Huang Chi-chiang ("Experiment in

abbot of both Guizong Monastery 歸宗寺 and Yuantong Monastery 圓通寺, the latter well-known as the site where Guanyin attained awakening. He and his monasteries attracted many visitors, including the famous scholar and statesman Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修 (1007–1072) who met him in 1044 and Su Xun 蘇洵 (1009–1066), the father of Su Shi 蘇軾 (1037–1101), who met him in 1047 on the way home to Sichuan (after a failed attempt at the civil service examinations).[51] Ouyang was so impressed with Ju'ne that in 1049 he recommended him as the first abbot of the newly-established Jingyin Chan Monastery 淨因禪院 in the capital.[52] Ju'ne, pleading eye trouble, sent in his place a Yunmen monk, Dajue Huailian 大覺懷璉 (1009–1090), who, while not his dharma heir, had served him as a secretary. Huailian went on to great success in the capital and may have played a significant role in Qisong's activities there.

According to the thirteenth-century Tiantai historian Zhipan 志磐, Huailian demonstrated great loyalty to at least one relationship established on Mt. Lu. Zhipan tells us that Huailian was very attached to Qisong's dharma-brother Yunju Xiaoshun 雲居曉舜. Xiaoshun, often called Shun Laofu 舜老夫, was abbot at Qixian Monastery 棲賢寺, an important Mt. Lu monastery, when in 1050 a local official, said to be nursing a grudge, ordered him defrocked.[53] When Huailian heard of this, he invited Xiaoshun to Kaifeng and housed him in his own room. Huailian's solicitude attracted the attention of the court, as it almost certainly was intended to, and Xiaoshun was summoned to court, restored to his status as a monk and the abbacy at Qixian Monastery, and presented with a purple robe and silver alms bowl.[54] One source adds that when Huailian was questioned, he explained that he had studied with Xiaoshun when young. The passage concludes with a recitation of Xiaoshun's Yunmen genealogy and the comment that Xiaoshun was an elder brother to Huailian.[55]

Syncretism," 121) suggests that Ju'ne studied with Xiaocong, but we simply do not know.

[51] On the latter, see Grant, 40.

[52] See Huang, "Elite and Clergy," 320.

[53] On Qixian Monastery, see Suzuki, *Tō Godai no Zenshū*, 209–10, 214–5, 284. Its abbacy had been held by Fayan dharma heirs but seems to have been taken over by Yunmen dharma heirs at some point in the early Song.

[54] *Fozu tongji*, T.49.2035.412b26–c4.

[55] The source for this is the Ming text *Shishi jigu lü* 釋氏稽古略 (T.49.2037.868b5–13), which cites the *Wudeng huiyuan* for this account, though I have not found it there. What are we to make of the remark about their being described as *kunji* 昆季,

We have little direct information about Qisong's life and contacts at Mt. Lu. Though he enjoyed a friendly correspondence with Ju'ne late in life, they do not seem to have been close in earlier years.[56] Nor does he seem to have known Huailian at the time, although they later knew each other in the capital.[57] It is also unclear whether Qisong's time at Mt. Lu overlapped with that of his dharma brother Xiaoshun, mentioned earlier, who became a leading Yunmen figure on a par with Ju'ne and the abbots of other major Mt. Lu monasteries.[58] Sources present Xiaoshun as conforming far more to type as a Chan master than they do Qisong; an awakening experience under Xiaocong is recounted as are his playful criticisms of other Chan masters. Indeed, Xiaoshun has attracted attention from historians of Chan because, in a passage found in the work of the great Linji master Dahui Zonggao 大慧宗杲 (1089–1163), he is the first known to have used the expression *geteng Chan* 葛藤禪, or 'kudzu Chan,' an expression which became a byword for "literary Chan" and the proliferation of language it allegedly encouraged.[59]

We do know that Qisong became involved with a different cluster of Yunmen monks. He seems to have lived at Kaixian Monastery 開先寺 at the southern foot of Mt. Lu, reportedly the most inaccessible of the monasteries at Mt. Lu, rather than the monasteries where Ju'ne served. Kaixian Monastery also had a strong connection with Yunmen

or elder and younger brothers? Since they did not share a master, this probably indicates instead a general Yunmen kinship plus a personal connection. We can see here a strong parallel to the way cousins and other members of extended families in China, especially those sharing a surname, often adopt terms of a closer relationship.

[56] On the identification of Ju'ne as the recipient of these letters, see Gimello, "Mārga and Culture," 426, n. 66.

[57] Wei Daoru quotes an amusing incident from the Yuan monk Nianchang's 念常 (1282–d. after 1344) *Fozu lidai tongzai* 佛祖歷代通載 about a monk wearing a paper robe in order to take notes as his master speaks (T.49.2036.677a), but misreads the name and title of the monk in question to refer to two monks, one of whom is Qisong (Du Jiwen 杜繼文 and Wei Daoru 魏道儒, *Zhongguo chanzong tongshi* 中國禪宗通史 (Jiangsu guji chubanshe, 1993), 404). Wei takes the story to be Foyin Liaoyuan's 佛印了元 (1032–1098) account of foolish dependence on words ("Later scholars fish and hunt written works; truly, it is like blowing into a net and wanting to fill it") occurring among Ju'ne's students. In fact, it is Foyin's commentary on Xianglin Chengyuan 香林澄遠 (908–987), a student of Yunmen Wenyan himself. If this were not clear from the passage itself, we know that Foyin did not arrive at Mt. Lu until after Qisong had left.

[58] *Luohu yelu*, ZZ 2b.15.5, 490d–491a.

[59] See Gimello, "Mārga and Culture," 404–5, 432, n. 99. As Gimello perceptively notes, however, both Dahui and Dōgen seem to acknowledge the potentially helpful nature of "word-tangles" between master and student.

lineage, thanks to a series of Yunmen abbots.[60] One of these abbots was Shanxian 善暹 (976–1059), and Shanxian seems to have an important influence on Qisong, introducing him to the writings of his own master, Deshan Huiyuan 德山慧遠 (fl. 1008–22) and his dharma brother, Shengqin 盛勤 (993–1060).[61] One has the impression, in fact, that Qisong spent most of his time reading. He was certainly reading widely and probably taking notes on what he read, for in an interlinear note to a text he wrote many years later, he recalls having seen a different character in a particular text in the library at Mt. Kuang 匡山, i.e., Mt. Lu, than that in the text he had at hand in Hangzhou.[62] If we are to judge by one of Qisong's earliest dated writings, an encomium on Huiyuan intended for inscription on a memorial hall and written in March 1041, he first offered his writing for public attention around this time.[63]

---

[60] In the *Linjian lu*, Huihong places Qisong at Kaixian Monastery (ZZ 2b.10.3, 307c). For this monastery and its Yunmen connections, see Mochizuki, v. 1, 388–9, as well as Suzuki, who describes the rapidity of its rise, thanks to the support of the Southern Tang, as well as its decline in the early Song (*Tō Godai no Zenshū*, 281).

[61] Shanxian is also known as Qingxian 慶暹. Qisong did develop a relationship with one of Shanxian's disciples, a monk called Baoyue 寶月. The two later saw each other in Hangzhou, where Baoyue was serving as a monastic official. Qisong wrote a preface to a collection of Baoyue's poetry and in 1061 wrote a short piece about the place where he had lived ("Faxi tang shi xu" 法喜堂詩敍, *Collected Works*, 705a–b). Their mutual interest in literary matters no doubt contributed to their friendship. Qisong is not known, however, to have had any relationship with another of Shanxian's disciples, Foyin Liaoyuan, who arrived at Mt. Lu after Qisong had left. Foyin went on to serve as Ju'ne's secretary before becoming abbot of Kaixian Monastery, which suggests strong ties between Kaixian Monastery and Guizong Monastery. Foyin also became a close friend of Su Shi, a relationship Beata Grant describes briefly in *Mt. Lu Revisited*, 101–3. Wei Daoru has also noted Foyin's association with and possible influence on Zhou Dunyi 周敦頤 (1017–1073), a significant figure for the Song Confucian revival more often linked with Daoist ideas than Buddhist monks (*Zhongguo chanzong tongshi*, 404).

[62] *Chuanfa zhengzong lun*, T.51.2080.777c26.

[63] The piece on Huiyuan is preserved in Qisong's *Collected Works* (719a–b) and also in Zhipan's *Fozu tongji* (T.49.2035.271a–b). The date is given only in the latter, however. On the origins of the *yintang* 影堂, or portrait hall, such as that for which Qisong wrote, see T. Griffith Foulk and Robert H. Sharf, "On the Ritual Use of Ch'an Portraiture in Medieval China," 170ff.

The only earlier dated piece is an early 1041 inscription concerning a late friend from his hometown, a Daoist master named Ma Zhizhang 馬知章 (*Collected Works*, 712c–713a). Ma had given Qisong an inkstone from Duanqi 端溪, a famed source of inkstones in Guangdong, which Qisong took along when he left his hometown. Because looking at it reminded him of his friend, he took care to carry it along everywhere and eventually composed a poem and preface giving the history of the inkstone.

Qisong also spent time with a small circle of literati from the nearby city of Jiujiang, particularly Zhou Shuzhi 周叔智 (d. 1043). He describes Zhou as well-versed in the classics as in history, and their friendship appears to have been based on the discussion of such topics rather than anything Buddhist.[64] Araki Kengo rightfully identifies this period as one of deepening interest with 'secular' study.[65]

In both the *Luohu yelu* and the *Yunwo jitan* 雲臥記談, the monk Xiaoying 曉瑩, a disciple of Dahui Zonggao, describes a series of three visits Qisong made to Li Gou 李覯 (1009–1059), famous for his many proposals for reform, including the severe limitation of Buddhist institutions.[66] According to Xiaoying, Qisong, distressed by the movement to repress Buddhism for which both Li and Ouyang Xiu were strong advocates, took his writings on the commonality of Buddhist and Confucian teachings on three visits to Li. Qisong reportedly conquered Li's objections to Buddhism and so impressed him with his prose that Li wrote Ouyang Xiu praising Qisong and disparaged his own generation's understanding in comparison to that to be found in Buddhist sutras.[67] No other sources make this claim, however, and though several modern scholars accept it, it is highly suspicious.[68] Although it is

---

[64] See the letter to a relation of Zhou (*Collected Works*, 708a–b) and his elegy for Zhou (*Collected Works*, 718b–c). Andō conflates these two men ("Butsunichi Meikyo Kaisū shikō," 98–101), but in the letter, Qisong is addressing a younger relative of Zhou whom Zhou had taught and whose later accomplishments as a *jinshi* and merciful official Qisong regrets his friend did not live to see.

[65] Araki Kengo, *Fuhyōben*, 257. But, confusingly, Araki places Qisong's transmission from Xiaocong after this (258).

[66] See S. Ueda, "Li Kou" in *Sung Biographies*, v. 2, 573–4; Étienne Balazs, trans. H.M. Wright, *Chinese Civilization and Bureaucracy*, 277–89; and Hsieh Shan-yuan, *Li Gou zhi shengping ji sixiang*, also in English as *The life and thought of Li Kou, 1009–1059*.

[67] *Luohu yelu*, ZZ 2b.15.5, 484d12–17, and a briefer version in *Yunwo jitan* 雲臥記談, ZZ 2b.21.1, 9d10–11. The *Fozu lidai tongzai* repeats the story in j. 28.

[68] See, for example, Makita, 142. In "Sōdai Butsunichi Kaisū ni tsuite," Abe Chōichi uses Xiaoying's account to help construct a far-fetched scenario in which Qisong's "Fujiao bian" influenced Ouyang Xiu's famous "Pengdang lun" 朋黨論 and by extension the Luling school of Confucian revival. This is untenable on several grounds. First, although Abe says that the "Fujiao bian" essays were written in the Qingli era (1041–48), Qisong himself says that he wrote them in 1049 or so (*Collected Works*, 654b5–8); at both points, Qisong was physically distant from Li Gou, the supposed conduit for Qisong's writings. In addition, to make his point, Abe pulls together passages and phrases from seven different pieces within the "Fujiao bian" to compare with one continuous passage of Ouyang's. This suggests that Qisong is far more likely to be echoing, even alluding to, Ouyang's language than the reverse. Liou Guei-jie [Liu Guijie] 劉貴傑 also reads Ouyang and Qisong together and sees no more than a

possible that Xiaoying had special knowledge of Li Gou because Li spent much of his life in Nancheng 南城, not far from Xiaoying's monastery in Fengcheng 豐城, it is at least as likely that Xiaoying was attempting to rewrite history in order to represent a well-known figure accepting Buddhism rather than continuing to devote considerable energy to enumerating its ills.

On to Zhejiang

At some point in his early thirties, Qisong left northern Jiangxi for parts east.[69] Huihong, who was not born until the year before Qisong died but seems to have been aided both by information that does not appear in Chen's biography and by a good imagination, recounts a conversation between the abbot of Kaixian, presumably Shanxian, and Qisong that suggests both Qisong's closeness to Shanxian and a reason for his departure from Mt. Lu. Shanxian, impressed by Qisong's literary ability, orders him to serve as his secretary. Qisong laughingly replies, "Why should I be a cup of ginger-apricot soup [i.e., a tonic] for you?" Huihong comments that because of this, Qisong left, going to live by the West Lake in Hangzhou, where for thirty years he kept his door shut and did not squander his time with frivolous socializing.[70]

Following the biographical accounts given by both Chen and Huihong, most scholars have assumed that Qisong traveled directly to

similarity of thought reflecting Qisong's supposed "Confucianizication" ("Qisong sixiang yanjiu").

The story of Qisong's influence on Li Gou might parallel the case of the Buddhist claim on Li Ao 李翱 (772–841). As Barrett argues, Li Ao was not associated with Buddhism until an account of his conversion by a Chan master appeared in two of the most important and widely-circulated early Song Buddhist works, *Song gaoseng zhuan* and *Jingde chuandeng lu* (*Li Ao: Buddhist, Taoist, or Neo-Confucian?* 28–32, 46–57).

[69] In 1059, Qisong wrote that he had been "in Wu 吳 [an ancient name for an area including Jiangsu, Shanghai, and parts of Anhui and Zhejiang] more than twenty years" (*Collected Works*, 706b7–8), and in his 1044 elegy for Jiujiang native Zhou Shuzhi, who had died the previous year (and had never left his hometown to hold office), he says that he had not seen him for six or seven years (*Collected Works*, 718b16–20). This would suggest that he left Mt. Lu in the late 1030s, but there is also evidence, particularly the 1041 inscription on Huiyuan, a seemingly local project, to suggest that he was still at Mt. Lu in the early 1040s.

[70] *Linjian lu*, ZZ 2b.10.3, 307c16–d1. This is the closest thing to a bon mot in any account of Qisong, and Huihong is the only biographer to describe him smiling or laughing.

Hangzhou, but Andō draws attention to evidence that he went first to Xiuzhou 秀州 (now Jiaxing 嘉興) in northern Zhejiang.[71] Andō speculates that Qisong was drawn to Xiuzhou because Yunmen Wenyan was born there and spent his early monastic career there. While that may be true in an attenuated way, we know for certain that Qisong was interested in more recent Yunmen generations in Xiuzhou, especially the master and dharma brother of Shanxian, the very abbot whose job offer Qisong supposedly turned down.

In 1041, Qisong wrote a preface for the *Yuanzong ji* 圓宗集, a collection of sayings by Chan masters from Śākyamuni to Yunmen Wenyan compiled by Shanxian's dharma brother Shengqin.[72] The following year, Qisong wrote a preface for the *Wuling ji* 武陵集, by Shanxian and Shengqin's master, Deshan Huiyuan 德山慧遠, a third-generation descendent of Yunmen Wenyan.[73] In the preface to Huiyuan's work, Qisong explains that in recent travels in Zhejiang, he had obtained Deshan Huiyuan's writings from Shengqin and Shanxian.[74]

Thus, it seems probable that Qisong was drawn to Xiuzhou because he had known Shanxian at Kaixian Monastery. Qisong's journey proved fruitful, for he came to know and respect Shanxian's dharma-brother Shengqin. Indeed, the strong admiration Qisong felt for both of them and his obvious familiarity with the details of their lives expressed in the memorial inscriptions Qisong wrote for Shanxian in 1052 and Shengqin in 1060—including Shengqin's sudden (and near-psychedelic) awakening and Shanxian's severe ascetic practices—stand in sharp contrast to his complete silence about his master Xiaocong and his own practices.

Given the apparent intimacy of Shanxian and Shengqin with Qisong, it is not surprising that a text called *Zongpai tu* 宗派圖 identified Qisong as an heir of Deshan Huiyuan. The *Zongpai tu* does not survive, but we know of this lineage attribution through Huihong, who,

[71] "Butsunichi Meikyo Kaisū shikō," 108–9. Andō writes that Qisong wrote the preface for Shengqin's *Yuanzong ji* while still at Mt. Lu, before visiting the author in Xiuzhou (109). I think it at least as likely that Qisong traveled to Xiuzhou, met Shenqin, received the material in question, and then wrote the preface either back at Mt. Lu or once he was settled in Hangzhou.

[72] "*Yuanzong ji* xu" 原宗集敍, *Collected Works*, 704b–c. Shengqin's collection has not survived.

[73] "*Wuling ji* xu" 武陵集敍, *Collected Works*, 704a–b. Deshan Huiyuan's text has not survived.

[74] *Collected Works*, 704a7–8.

in the *Linjian lu* 林間錄, calls it a mistake.[75] However close these ties, neither Shanxian in Mt. Lu nor Shengqin in Xiuzhou detained Qisong for long, and he soon found his way to Lin'an, as Hangzhou was then called, and a major cultural center of the Song.

Settling in Hangzhou: "He Shut the Door and Wrote"

Chen dates Qisong's arrival in Hangzhou, often referred to as Qiantang 錢塘 for the river to the south of the city, to the Qingli 慶曆 era (1041–8).[76] Qisong does not discuss his motive for moving to Hangzhou, but it seems to have been yet another step in his progression toward the cultural center of the empire. He spent most of the rest of his life there, including the mid-1040s through the 1050s, a productive period during which he wrote the works for which he is best known. There he became in time a prominent member of the monastic elite, listed by Su Shi as one of the five Buddhist masters Su was able to meet while a young man in Hangzhou.[77]

Chinese monastic hagiographies, as well as the poems and correspondence of many monks, frequently describe a tension between urban life, prone to the demands and distractions of interaction with the laity and state, and rural life, more conducive to solitude and discipline. In the case of Qisong, his years in Hangzhou seem to have been both satisfyingly social and conducive to extensive writing. Perhaps only a city with as many monasteries as Hangzhou and a corresponding abundance of educated and ambitious monks willing to

[75] *Chanlin sengbao zhuan*, 2b.10.3, 307c. Interestingly, Huihong does not grant entries in this work to Deshan Huiyuan, Shengqin or Shanxian.

This lost work is probably the *Wujia zongpai* 五家宗派 of Jinshan Tanying 金山曇穎 (989–1063), a prominent Linji monk also known as Daguan Tanying. It is not extant, but from scattered references, Schlütter describes it as downgrading Yunmen to a mere branch of Linji (*How Zen Became Zen*, 141–2, 173), although switching Qisong from one branch of Yunmen to another does not serve this purpose. Huang Chi-chiang has offered a convincing revision of Tanying's death date, given by Huihong as 1060, to 1063, which means that Qisong might have met him when he stopped at Jinshan on his way back to Hangzhou from the capital ("Experiment in Syncretism," 171, n. 83).

[76] Zhang Qingyuan 张清泉 dates Qisong's arrival in Hangzhou as 1038–39, based on a remark Qisong made in 1059 (details above in n. 67) about being in Wu more than 20 years (*Beisong Qisong de Ru-Shi ronghui sixiang* 北宋契嵩的儒釋融會, 46–7). Wu, however, includes Xiuzhou.

[77] See Huang, "Elite and Clergy," 310.

take on the duties that Qisong, according to Huihong, had at least once evaded, could afford to allow Qisong to conserve his energy and limit social exchanges to those that stimulated him and prompted him to write.

Huaiwu, the tenacious collector of Qisong's works, tells us that Qisong did not live for long in any one spot in Hangzhou.[78] Qisong also did some traveling, including setting out in 1051 to give lectures at South Mt. Heng 南衡山 in Hunan, only to encounter bandits, be robbed, and abandon the trip.[79] Eventually, though, by the end of the 1050s at the latest, Qisong settled at the Lingyin Monastery, one of the largest and most important monasteries in the empire. There he became an esteemed figure, contributing an essay celebrating Mt. Lingyin and asked, as Andō notes, to compose the memorial inscription for the abbot Puci Huanmin 普慈幻旻 (999–1059).[80] In time his scholarly reputation was such that when Ŭich'ŏn 義天 (1055–1101), the Koryŏ prince and great Buddhist scholar, was reckoning his own knowledge he considered only his own teacher and "perhaps" Qisong to surpass him.[81]

In Hangzhou, if not earlier, Qisong encountered widespread admiration for both the writing style and the anti-Buddhist opinions of the Tang figure Han Yu 韓愈. In 1042, Ouyang Xiu, Han Yu's most forceful advocate at the time, wrote an essay entitled "Benlun" 本論, or "Discussion of the Fundamentals," which included a pointed attack on Buddhism.[82] According to Chen, in the southeast, Zhang Biaomin 章表民, Huang Aoyu 黄聱隅, and Li Gou were also actively voicing criticism of Buddhism.[83] In response, as one source puts it, Qisong

[78] *Collected Works*, 747b24.

[79] See Chen Shunyu (*Collected Works*, 648b17) and an annotation to the *Fujiao bian* on the incident (*Kankō kyō chū hogyō hen*).

[80] "Wulin shan zhi" 武林山志 [Wulin shan being another name for Lingyin shan], *Collected Works*, 709c–710c; "Butsunichi Meikyo Kaisū shikō," 110. A useful description of Lingyin Monastery and list of sources on its history may be found in Meir Shahar, "The Lingyin Si Monkey Disciples and the Origins of the Sun Wukong," 198–200.

[81] See Huang Chi-chiang, "Ŭich'ŏn's Pilgrimage and the Rising Prominence of the Korean Monastery in Hang-chou during the Sung and Yüan Periods," 247, and Huang, "Shi-i shih-chi Kao-li sha-men I-t'ien ju Sung ch-iu-fa k'ao-lun," 55–56.

[82] See James T.C. Liu, *Ouyang Hsiu, An Eleventh-Century Neo-Confucian*, 155–72.

[83] *Collected Works*, 648b3–6. I earlier cast doubt on Xiaoying's account of Qisong pacifying Li Gou's anti-Buddhist sentiment, but here I must note that Qisong corresponded and had friends in common with Zhang Biaomin. See "Yu Zhang Biaomin

"shut the door and wrote."[84] In 1049 or so, he produced "Yuanjiao" 原教, or "The Source of the Teachings," in which he argues that the Buddhist ethical requirements known as the "ten goods," *shishan* 十善, are in fact the same as the Confucian ethical requirements called the "five constants," *wuchang* 五常. After seven years of further reading, he revised it as the "Guang yuanjiao" 廣原教."[85] During the same period, in 1052 or 1053, he also wrote "Xiao lun," the essay on filiality mentioned earlier for its expression of his gratitude to his parents for their role in his Buddhist career.[86] He also composed several more pieces similarly harmonizing Buddhist and Confucian values.

Qisong as a *Ru*

Chen describes Qisong's campaign in defense of Buddhism as follows:

> [He] wrote the "Yuanjiao," the "Xiao lun," and other pieces, more than ten in total, to illustrate that one thread [runs through] the paths of *ru* and Śākyamuni and to counter these [anti-Buddhist] theories. All the gentlemen read them and then loved his writing. [They] also stood in awe of the superiority of his reasoning; none could defeat him. Because of this, they began to associate with him. When he met gentlemen who despised the Buddha, Zhongling [Qisong] could not help earnestly explaining [Buddhist teachings] to them. Because of this, the attacks [on Buddhism] gradually stopped.[87]

Two qualities distinguish Qisong as a defender of the Buddhist faith: his deliberate use of plain *guwen*, or ancient-style writing, rather than the elaborate *pianwen* 駢文 style, and his sincere admiration for and engagement with the Confucian tradition. *Guwen* is associated not only with Han Yu's style, itself a revival of pre-Tang writing styles, but also with Han's political and cultural position. In the Northern Song, *guwen* came to be associated with a celebration of the values of the

---

mishu shu" 與章表民秘書書 (*Collected Works*, 698a–b) and "Faxi tang shi xu" 法喜堂詩敍 (*Collected Works*, 705a–b).

[84] *Rentian baojian* 人天寶鑑, ZZ2b.21.1.

[85] *Collected Works*, 654b5–8. On these influential essays, see Koichi Shinohara, "Buddhism and Confucianism in Ch'i-sung's Essay on Teaching (Yüan-tao)" and Wei Daoru, "Cong lunli guan dao xinxing lun," 469–74. Andō notes that Chen Shunyu mistakenly claims that these essays were written in the Qingli period (1041–48) ("Butsunichi Meikyo Kaisū shikō," 108–14).

[86] *Collected Works*, 660b4–5.

[87] *Collected Works*, 648b6–10.

ancient sages and active political reform to put them into practice; it is also strongly associated with a rejection of everything perceived as foreign or dangerous for China, including Buddhism.[88]

A number of earlier Song Buddhist masters, most famously Zanning 贊寧 (919–1001) and the Tiantai master Zhiyuan 智圓 (976–1022), are known for their mastery of the ancient-style writing based on the prose of the Confucian classics, and Zanning in particular prefigured Qisong's combination of the role of defender of the faith with a reputation as a 'Confucian monk.'[89] Unfortunately, Zanning's writings on these topics do not survive, and it is unclear whether Qisong knew them. He refers to Zanning only as the author of the *Song gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳 (and criticizes him harshly for failing to recognize Chan patriarchs as such). It seems quite possible that Qisong was not consciously imitating Zanning in any way but instead responding similarly to both the appeal and cachet of ancient-style writing and the need to defend Buddhism.[90] Qisong engaged self-consciously with criticism of his multiple interests and allegiances, as did Zhiyuan.[91]

At a time when good writing was often equated with good thinking, Qisong's mastery of ancient-style writing won him many readers who were otherwise uninterested in or antagonistic towards Buddhism. His use of *guwen* signaled his respect for Chinese culture as it existed before the rise of Daoism and the arrival of Buddhism. Nor does this seem to have been a mere ploy or strategy. In an essay explaining his studio or literary name Jizi 寂子, "Master Stillness," Qisong writes:

> [I], Jizi, am one who studies Buddhism [*fo*]. Because the awakening it attains is quiet and profound, [I] call [myself] "Jizi." [I], Jizi, already

[88] See Peter Bol, *"This Culture of Ours"*, chap. 5–7. As we will note in the next chapter, during the eleventh century, a shifting group of advocates for *guwen* and political and cultural reform moved in and out of power. It happens that when Qisong made his appeal to the court, *guwen* advocates were in power.

[89] See Albert Welter, "A Buddhist Response to the Confucian Revival: Tsan-ning and the Debate over *Wen* in the Early Sung." For an interesting essay on Zhiyuan that includes comments on his use of Buddhist and non-Buddhist genres, see Koichi Shinohara, "Illness and Self: Zhiyuan's Two Autobiographical Essays." Andō Tomonobu has also written an essay comparing Zhiyuan and Qisong: "Kozan Chien to Myōkyō Kaisū: Sōdai nikōsō ni miru Ju-Butsu nikyō no ichi zuke" 弧山智円と明教契嵩: 宋代二高僧に見る儒仏二教の位置ずけ.

[90] Speculation based in part on Welter's description of the hardening stance of the ideology paired with guwen writing and of the affiliation of Chan with a more inclusive interpretation of the purpose of culture and writing ("A Buddhist Response to the Confucian Revival," 47–51).

[91] Shinohara, "Zhiyuan's Two Autobiographical Essays," 282, 285, 289–90, 293–4.

> study its teachings. [I] also delight in studying *ru*. [I] have made myself deeply familiar with *ru* books and take pleasure in [their] language. For this reason, scholars have argued. Those who study Buddhism say Jizi is definitely fickle. [He] cannot concentrate and keep his path pure; how can one make it mixed? Those who study *ru* say that Jizi is not truly a Buddhist. Such a one stays only temporarily in the dharma of the Śākya clan.... Because of this, I said to two guests, I enjoy *ru*. Therefore, I take [from it] that which harmonizes with my path and use it.[92]

Qisong's writings bear out this self-description. They show a deep knowledge of Confucian tradition and admiration for its sages. While he views Buddhism as possessing a higher truth, he does not dismiss Confucian teachings as 'merely' provisional. He considers them worthy of study and writes essays, like one on the *Zhongyong* 中用 or Doctrine of the Mean, chapter of the *Liji* 禮記, with few overt reference to Buddhism at all.[93] This participation in classical culture won him many friends in Confucian circles. It also prompted criticism, as he alludes above, from fellow Buddhists that he did not "keep his path pure." The extent of his identification with the Confucian tradition comes out in the essay "Fei Han" 非韓 ["Against Han"] written to refute Han Yu's famous essay attacking Buddhism; in it, he argues that Han himself had only a shallow understanding of the Confucian tradition and had not attained its highest path.[94]

Understanding Qisong's religious affiliations and cultural affinities is no easy matter, and the field of Chinese religions is still very much in the midst of figuring out how best to understand and articulate the nature and interrelationship of what Robert Campany, searching for

---

[92] *Collected Works*, 686a11–18. The line about being fickle echoes a *Shiji* 史記 passage in which Chen Ping is chastised for his fickleness toward rulers and then eloquently defends himself. See *The Records of the Grand Historian: Han Dynasty I*, trans. Burton Watson, 118.

This passage shares a great deal with Zhiyuan's statement explaining his choice of the style *Zhongyong zi* 中用子, "Master of the Mean." He describes himself as one who "lectured on Buddhist scriptures, but also read the writings of [the] Duke of Zhou, Confucius, Yang Xiong, and Mencius and frequently practised the 'ancient style' (*guwen*) writing and honored the Way" (Shinohara, "Illness and Self: Zhiyuan's Two Autobiographical Essays," 279–80).

[93] See Huang Chi-chiang, "*Chung-yung* in Northern Sung Intellectual Discourse: The Buddhist Components." Zhiyuan also wrote on the *Zhongyong*, but his work does not survive. See Welter, "A Buddhist Response," 36–7, 50, and Shinohara, "Zhiyuan's Autobiographical Essay, 'The Master of the Mean.'"

[94] *Collected Works*, 722a17. Qisong was not the only one to criticize Han's understanding of the *ru* tradition; see, for example, Peter Bol's brief discussion of Su Shi's criticisms of Han ("*This Culture of Ours*," 268–9).

alternatives to the term 'religion' for the Chinese world, calls "bodies of traditions" and "bodies of teachings."[95] Most scholars have moved away from any notion of Chinese religions as isolated and independent from each other, but no consensus has emerged about how to describe them without either essentializing them or losing sight of the very real distinctions that at least some participants saw between them.

In thinking about Chinese religious life and the presence of distinct traditions within it, some have found Zürcher's metaphor of mountains sharing a base and distinct only at the summits quite useful, but this metaphor has its limits.[96] Barend ter Haar has rejected it almost entirely, arguing that "Only when we confine our gaze to the normative religious culture(s) of written doctrine and codified ritual may the so-called 'tops' of the pyramids seem separate to us. Even at this level, in fact, mutual influence and close interaction were the order of the day."[97] Natasha Heller has commented that ter Haar goes too far in denying the distinctiveness of religious traditions but agrees that the image of elites isolated on their summits is untenable and inaccurate, failing to express what elites often have in common, such as the literary tradition.[98]

Qisong, it seems, existed in just this overlap, and he was not only capable of admirable *guwen* and educated in Confucian classics but committed to them. Qisong used the term *ru* constantly, and it is clear that for him, as is typical by the Song, it represents a distinct tradition of people and texts and moral teachings. It is also clear that he objects to his contemporaries who are advocating a form of exclusive and partisan *ru* identity. In fact, he takes on the role of a defender of *ru* and accuses Han Yu and his Song followers of misunderstanding the *ru* tradition. Zhiyuan, although he took a different stance on Han Yu, similarly positions himself as a defender both of the dharma and of *ru*

---

95 "On the Very Idea of Religions," 308.

96 "Buddhist Influence on Early Buddhism," 146.

97 "Buddhist-Inspired Options: Aspects of Religious Lay Life in the Lower Yangzi from 1100 to 1340," 151. Christine Mollier, discussing the interaction and mutual influence of Daoism and Buddhism in China, complicates the picture by pointing out that religious practitioners who were neither elite nor illiterate were often very concerned with affiliating themselves quite explicitly with one tradition or another, even as they borrowed and blended (*Buddhism and Taoism Face to Face*, 209–10).

98 "'Illusory Abiding': The Life and Work of Zhongfeng Mingben (1263–1323)," 8–9.

in his reaction to anti-Buddhist contemporaries, as in the following from a poem entitled "On Explaining Han Yu and Liu Zongyuan":

> Those born after study Han Yü
> And snarl at Buddhism like dogs.
> Before knowing Master Han's *dao*
> They imitate Master Han's resentment.[99]

The intense participation of Zanning, Zhiyuan, Qisong, and other Song monks in *ru* studies, despite or because of "Master Han," contrasts sharply with the classic trope of the young man who abandons his study of classics once he encounters Buddhism. Sengzhao 僧肇 (trad. 384–414) is the most famous example of this.[100] John Kieschnick has pointed out that just as a hermit-scholar exists in relation to a scholar-official, the ideal of the scholar-monk plays off the model of the scholar-official. He writes:

> Certainly the scholar-monk's vocation demanded that he be versed in the Buddhist scriptures, but this was not enough. He was also expected to have mastered the Chinese classics, even if only to lament their limitations; to do anything less was to be less than literate. As we have seen, both the Buddhist ascetic and the Buddhist thaumaturge drew on long-standing Chinese traditions. But the scholar-monk is a more extreme case; it was necessary for those monks to prove that their respect for Buddhist knowledge was born of a thorough understanding of Chinese learning and a consequent recognition of its shortcomings.[101]

Kieschnick also points out that monks' biographies mention success in examinations, not only to make the point that the monk in question was knowledgeable but that he walked away from that sort of knowledge and the position it might bring him.[102] Stories are also told of exceptional monks like Daoan 道安 (312–385), who was called on to help with deciphering a difficult inscription and proved so much more learned than the literati of the capital that he was thereafter regularly consulted on all sorts of matters.[103]

But different times apparently call for different monks, and in the late Five Dynasties and Northern Song, we see a different pattern. As

---

[99] Linda D'Argenio, "Poetry in Transition: Views and Practice of Poetic Writing during the Early Song Dynasty (960–1022)."
[100] *The Eminent Monk*, 113.
[101] *The Eminent Monk*, 113.
[102] *The Eminent Monk*, 114.
[103] *The Eminent Monk*, 114.

Jiang Yibin 蔣義斌 has noted, instead of Zongmi 宗密 granting the Confucian tradition a place in a hierarchy of teachings, we have Qisong confirming its value as a complement to the Buddhist teachings.[104] Rather than bright young men who do well in their *ru* studies but give them up to become monks, albeit retaining their earlier erudition, we see a number of monks seeking out *ru* texts and literati conversation partners. This shift might mask the fact that *ru* texts were probably always in the monastery as part of a basic curriculum, but it does make clear that some monks, just like their literati counterparts, were getting caught up in the Northern Song intellectual movements debating *wen* 文.[105] Given the prominence of anti-Buddhist rhetoric on the part of some participants in these debates, some of this monastic attention was clearly a defensive action, as demonstrated by Welter's analysis of Zanning's campaign to win the Buddhist tradition recognition as a legitimate part of *wen*.[106] Some monastic engagement with *ru* was probably due to aesthetic excitement about rediscovered and reinvigorated literary forms, but some of it was also what we find in Zhiyuan and Qisong: attraction not only to beautiful language but to the moral teachings many *guwen* writers advocated.[107]

Reportedly half of what Qisong wrote was lost in the upheaval at the end of the Northern Song so we cannot speak conclusively about all his interests, but Qisong's surviving works are dominated by two themes or motives: the defense of the dharma against anti-Buddhist critics and the defense of Chan lineage against critics of Chan. In both cases, he declares that he did the work in reaction to perceived threats. By contrast, the many short essays he wrote on *ru* themes, independent of a defense of Buddhism as good for society, seem to be the only work he did not do defensively or reactively but for their own sake. Although it has been suggested that he wrote them only as a gambit to gain literati approval for his other writings, the content of the essays themselves, as well as other statements, suggests that Qisong did not master *ru* studies only to defend Buddhism. He exhibits a genuine

---

104 *Songdai Ru-Shi tiaohelun ji paifo lun zhi yanjin*, 10.

105 See Zürcher, "Buddhism and Education in T'ang Times," 35–6, 47–50.

106 "A Buddhist Response to the Confucian Revival," 21–61.

107 Unfortunately, as Welter notes, Zanning's Confucian writings do not survive for us to understand his engagement with *ru* beyond the political ("A Buddhist Response to the Confucian Revival," 35).

immersion in and devotion to that canon and Northern Song interpretations of it.

Qisong himself reports that his devotion both to Buddhist and *ru* teachings unsettles his fellow monks. It is they who introduce the notion of purity and the disapproval of mixing, they who worry that his attention to *ru* poses a danger to the integrity of the Buddhist path or perhaps just to Qisong's progress on it. He responds by explaining that he delights in *ru* because of what it shares with the Buddha's teachings. He goes on to give a version of his well-known correlation of Buddhist values with the five *ru* virtues. He refers to *shengren* 聖人, sages, a category that for him does not distinguish between *fo* and *ru*. As Qisong sees it, the sages simply want people to be good, and he sees the wisdom in their teachings. He responds again to the criticism from Buddhists by asking, "Where is the impurity in that?" He also reacts again to the notion that he is not really a Buddhist, but is just "staying temporarily in the dharma of the Śākya clan," with praise for monastic cultivation of body and mind. A little later in the same essay, Qisong speaks of the sages again, saying, "Looking up to the sky, bowing down to the ground"—in other words, showing his sincerity and seriousness and that he is hiding nothing from the powers that be—"I do not disregard the sages."[108]

Although Qisong never articulates it explicitly, one has the sense that in part he regards his interests as a matter of disposition. Why does he delight in *ru*? He simply does; he recognizes it as the work of sages and loves its language. He does not expect most monks to share his interests, which might explain why there is no evidence that he directly promoted *ru* studies in the sangha. Without denying ter Haar's "mutual influence and close interaction," it is clear that a tension persisted between the various elements of literati identity and monastic Buddhist identity, a tension that helped animate the relationship between literati and elite monks.

Buddhist Writings

Along with the "Yuanjiao" and "Xiao lun," the set of works known as the *Fujiao pian* 輔教篇 [Essays to Aid the Teaching] includes thor-

[108] T.52.2115.686b11–12.

oughly Buddhist pieces like a long essay in praise of the *Platform Sūtra*. This particular essay inspired his friend Lang Jian 郎簡 (968–1056) to offer to underwrite a printing of the *Platform Sūtra* on the condition that Qisong revise the text then available, which Qisong regarded as corrupted. In a preface dated 1056, Lang writes that after two years, Qisong obtained an old manuscript from Caoqi 曹溪, i.e., a Guangdong site associated with Huineng, with far fewer errors from which he made corrections.[109]

In the 1050s, Qisong was busy not only with his work on the *Platform Sūtra* and the "Yuanjiao bian," but also with the *Chuanfa zhengzong* 傳法正宗, or True Lineage, texts.[110] In the following chapter, I detail the circumstances of their composition and acceptance at court, but for now, let us note that, like the "Yuanjiao" and "Guang yuanjiao," they were written in response to perceived criticism and composed over an extended period. In his own interlinear notes for one of the texts, Qisong explains that he wrote the first section and then, seven years later, after discovering a new source of evidence, wrote the following sections.[111] Since he took the *True Lineage* texts to the capital with him in 1061, he must have begun writing them in 1054 at the latest. The way in which Qisong wrote and revised both

---

[109] *Collected Works*, 703b–c. Lang, Qisong's patron for this project, was already a close friend. Although we do not know the exact circumstances of their meeting, the fact that Lang, early in his career, had served as an official in Qisong's home district in Guangxi might have prompted their meeting. Their friendship began in 1041 or 1042, when Lang retired to Hangzhou, his hometown, and lasted until his death in 1056, the year Qisong's revised edition of the *Platform Sūtra* was printed.

On the fate of Qisong's edition of the *Platform Sūtra*, see Schlütter, "A Study in the Genealogy of the *Platform Sutra*." Schlütter argues that although Qisong's edition has long been considered the edition from which surviving editions descend, this is not the case.

[110] The *True Lineage* texts are a set of three works: *Chuanfa zhengzong ji* 傳法正宗記 [Record of the Dharma Transmission of the True Lineage, hereafter Record], *Chuanfa zhengzong dingzu tu* 傳法正宗定祖圖 [Chart Establishing the Patriarchs of Dharma Transmission of the True Lineage, hereafter Chart], and *Chuanfa zhengzong lun* 傳法正宗論 [Critical Essay on Dharma Transmission of the True Lineage, hereafter Critical Essay].

The *lun* 論 of the last work has previously been translated as 'discourse.' I follow Arthur E. Link, who offers the translation 'critical essay' in a discussion of the critical comments interspersed in the narratives of Huijiao's *Gaoseng zhuan* ("Hui-chiao's 'Critical Essay on the Exegetes of the Doctrines' in the Kao-seng chuan." Link also gives a brief survey of the use of the term in earlier historical works. As I will argue in Chapter Six, I believe that Qisong wrote this additional work as the outgrowth and consolidation of the critical comments he makes at intervals throughout the *Record*.

[111] *Critical Essay*, 776a4.

philosophical and historical works over a number of years confirms that his work arose and developed in reaction to older texts and in conversation with contemporaries, both sympathetic and hostile.

By the late 1050s, Qisong's works were being circulated widely in Hangzhou and beyond. Around the same time, *Essays to Aid the Teaching* itself was printed in Hangzhou. We do not have the details of this printing, but we do know the consequences. *Essays to Aid the Teaching* came to the attention of Li Duanyuan 李端愿 (d. 1091), perhaps through the Hangzhou prefect Tang Xun 唐詢 (1005–1064).[112] Li was the son of Li Zunxu 李遵勗 (d. 1038), the scion of a military family who married a daughter of Taizong 太宗 (r. 976–997) and who compiled the 1036 Chan lineage history *Tiansheng guang denglu* 天聖廣燈錄.[113] According to a letter Qisong wrote to thank him, Li Duanyuan, like his father a lay dharma heir in the Linji line, wrote his cousin, the emperor Renzong 仁宗 (r. 1022–1063), to request a purple robe, one of the highest possible honors for a monk, for Qisong.[114]

Renzong approved Li's request. Qisong's letter thanking Li captures some of the excitement surrounding the bestowal of the robe, which occurred sometime between mid-1058 and late 1060;[115] he recounts

---

[112] Tang Xun 唐詢 had been involved in a Li family matter a decade earlier. Li Zunxu's younger sister was the widow of Wu Yu's 吳育 brother, and Tang publicly accused Wu, with whom he was feuding, of refusing to allow her to remarry so as to retain close ties to the influential Li family. See *Songshi* 10042–3 and Patricia Ebrey, *The Inner Quarters*, 206, 288, n. 18.

[113] For the relationship of the Li family to the imperial family, see *Songshi* 8774–5. John Chaffee remarks on the pattern, evident through the late eleventh century, of imperial clan members intermarrying mainly with military families (*Branches of Heaven: A History of the Imperial Clan of Sung China*, 55–6, 162–5). Huang Chichiang details the involvement of generations of the Li family with Buddhism ("Experiment in Syncretism," 84–9). Huang states that Li Duanyuan made his request based on his admiration of the *True Lineage* texts ("Experiment in Syncretism," 88–9, and "Elite and Clergy," 315), but Qisong's letter of thanks refers only to the letter Li sent him after reading the *Essays to Aid the Teaching*. Indeed, without naming Li Zunxu or his *Tiansheng guangdenglu*, the *Record* criticizes certain positions Li Zunxu took in his account of Chan history (Foulk, "Controversies Concerning the 'Separate Transmission,'" 258–9). We do not know if Li Duanyuan realized this, took offence at the criticism or overlooked it in light of his general sympathy with Qisong's causes.

[114] See Qisong's letter thanking Li, *Collected Works*, 696c–697a. Some scholars have assumed that Qisong was granted a purple robe during the trip to Kaifeng, but Qisong's second memorial to the emperor and the *Record* identify him as a monk upon whom this honor has already been bestowed, and this letter helps explain how Qisong came to the attention of the court before his trip to Kaifeng in 1061.

[115] This dating derives from the tenure of the Hangzhou prefect, Tang Xun 唐詢, Qisong mentions in his letter to Li Duanyuan. He served from mid-1058 to late 1060 (Li Zhiliang 李之亮, *Song Liangzhelu junshou nianbiao* 宋兩浙路郡守年表, 11–12).

the arrival of the imperial command at the office of the prefect, who immediately summoned Qisong. Qisong reports that he protested his own unworthiness and tried repeatedly to decline the honor, but that the prefect disregarded Qisong's plea.[116] The next day, before the great assembly of the Lingyin Monastery, he assumed the ceremonial robe.

Mission to the Capital

In 1061, Qisong traveled to Kaifeng with *Essays to Aid the Teaching* and the *True Lineage* texts. He met with success in a matter of months. His works were accepted into the imperial canon, a rare honor for a living author. He was rewarded with an honorary title, "Mingjiao dashi" 明教大師 [Great Master Illuminating the Teaching], and offered a post as abbot of a capital monastery, which he refused. He also had the opportunity to meet eminent figures like Ouyang Xiu. In the next chapter, I will discuss the details of Qisong's trip as well as the many issues raised by his triumph. In particular, I will address the criticisms that prompted Qisong to compose and revise the texts, the different ways in which he presented himself and his works to appeal to the court, and the nature of both his sectarianism and his multiple allegiances.

Later Life

We possess relatively little information about the period after Qisong's trip to Kaifeng. His surviving writings from this period amount only to an inscription, an epitaph, and a handful of letters. One might suspect that he stopped writing after his great triumph or simply slowed down because of his age, but in fact, Huaiwu's postscript suggests that

[116] Given the circumstances, Qisong's protests were almost certainly a ritual display of humility. Huang Min-chih, however, notes that the first known reference to purple robes being sold occurs in Shenzong's reign, not long after Qisong received his (*Songdai fojiao shehui jingji shi lun ji*, 453). Critics had questioned this honor as early as the mid-Tang, as a poem by Zheng Gu (fl. 851–909) indicates, and continued to do so in first decades of the Song, as a satiric poem by Wei Ye (960–1091) attests (Huang, *Songdai fojiao shehui jingji shi lun ji*, 450). Huang Min-chih's research continues to be the main scholarship on purple robes, though John Kieschnick has recently made a contribution (*The Impact of Buddhism on Chinese Material Culture*, 100–3).

the portion of Qisong's writings lost in the upheaval of the early twelfth century were from this period.[117]

In the mid-1060s Qisong took his first known administrative position, as abbot at Jinghui Monastery 淨慧寺 at Mt. Fori 佛日山 not far from Hangzhou.[118] Recommending him for this post was Cai Xiang 蔡襄 (1012–1067), who served as prefect of Hangzhou under Yingzong 英宗 (r. 1063–1067) from 1065 until mid-1066 and was later recognized as one of the four great calligraphers of the Song.[119] After the earlier evasion of monastery duties reported by Huihong and then his refusal of an abbacy in the capital, one wonders why Qisong agreed to become an abbot.[120] Was he bowing to pressure, interested in the responsibility, or accepting a comfortable sinecure? It is especially intriguing that it was Cai Xiang, who shared the anti-Buddhist views of friends like Ouyang Xiu, who recommended him. The monks of Jinghui Monastery were reportedly a dishonest and shallow lot, guilty both of idleness and corrupted teachings.[121] Makita sees in this description the likelihood that monks were charging exorbitant fees for funeral services, and Chi-chiang Huang considers Qisong to have been forced into the position by Cai.[122] Perhaps Qisong and Cai, despite radically different views about Buddhism as a whole, agreed that this particular monastery needed a return to strict discipline. Perhaps Cai took it upon himself to recommend a monk his friend Ouyang approved of, regardless of Qisong's willingness. Whatever the circumstances of the appointment, according to his biographer Chen, Qisong set such a high standard of conduct that a number of "false" monks left.[123] Since Qisong's writings, so often inspired by indignation at others, do not

---

[117] *Collected Works*, 746b–747a. Huaiwu makes references to a *Jiayou ji* 嘉祐記, Jiayou being the reign period 1056–1063, and a *Zhiping ji* 治平記, Zhiping being 1064–1067. Neither collection survives as such, but pieces identified with the former survive in the *Collected Works*.

[118] Suzuki Tetsuo, drawing on the *Zhejiang tongzhi* 浙江通志, j. 227, notes that Fori Monastery 佛日院, to the northeast of Renhe 仁和 prefecture, had been built in 942 by the Wuyue 吳越 king (*Tō Godai zenshū shi* 唐五代禅宗史, 163). Qisong is sometimes known as Fori Qisong because of this, his only position as abbot.

[119] See Liu Lin 劉琳, "Cai Xiang nianpu"; Amy McNair, "The Sung Calligrapher Ts'ai Hsiang," 61–75; and Yoshinobu Shiba, "Ts'ai Hsiang," 1026–9.

[120] The one hint that Qisong did pay attention to the politics of abbatical appointments is a comment, as Schlütter notes, on the shady methods used by some to obtain them (*How Zen Became Zen*, 194 n. 64 and 36–41 for the larger context).

[121] *Collected Works*, 699c16–17.

[122] *Chūgoku kinsei Bukkyōshi no kenkyū*, 153; "Elite and Clergy," 316.

[123] *Collected Works*, 648c12–13.

give the impression that he was an easy-going personality, and a poem by Su Shi describes Qisong as always frowning, it is quite easy to imagine him a severe abbot.[124]

After a short period, probably a few years, Qisong retired from his position at Jinghui Monastery. (Interestingly, Huailian, to whom Emperor Yingzong promised any position he liked when he left Kaifeng, became abbot of this monastery after Qisong. One wonders if it offered an attractive retirement or still needed a firm hand).[125] Qisong spent some time at a monastery south of Hangzhou but then returned to Lingyin Monastery. In his final years, he seems to have grown quite homesick for the south and to have considered moving back there, but in the end, he stayed in Hangzhou, where he died in 1072, at the age of sixty-six *sui*.

Qisong's cremation was a major event attended by large crowds, including Hangzhou vice prefect Su Shi and the Japanese monk Jōjin 成尋 (1011–1081), and several sources report that *śarīra*, fragments of the body that survive cremation, were found, thus confirming Qisong's greatness. (Qisong had himself written on *śarīra* as "proof" of the Buddhist path.)[126] The monastery erected a stūpa to hold them.[127] Later accounts, including that of Huihong, increase the number of "indestructible" relics to five.[128]

Unlike the reported number of his relics, Qisong's own dharma transmission did not increase. Although we know the name of at least

---

[124] This passage is translated by Grant, *Mt. Lu Revisited*, 78.

[125] See Huang, "Clergy and Elite," 320.

[126] *Collected Works*, 718c–719a.

[127] According to Chen, these indestructible parts were of three of the six "roots" of the body (*Collected Works*, 648a17–18). The *Jianzhong jingguo xu denglu* 建中靖國續燈錄, published in 1101, provides more details, saying that his eyes, tongue, and penis were not destroyed (XZJ 78.1556.671c22). For a discussion of legends of tongues that do not burn when the body is cremated, see Suwa Gijun 諏訪義純, *Chūgoku nanchō Bukkyōshi no kenkyū* 中国南朝仏教史の研究, 328–30. (My thanks to James Robson for this reference.) In the examples he gives, Suwa notes the close link to recitation of the *Lotus Sūtra*. This does not apply, as far as we know, in the case of Qisong, and it raises the question of why Qisong's tongue was said not to burn. Was it his defense of the dharma against critics or his promotion of Chan lineage? Or perhaps his devotion to the true dharma, as with Kumārajīva, whose *Gaoseng zhuan* entry records a vow he made just before death that his tongue survive cremation if he had transmitted the dharma correctly (T.50.2059.332c24–333a6).

[128] *Linjian lu*, XZJ 2b.10.3, 323a, lists the relics as the crown, eyes, teeth, tongue, fine hairs, and penis, and the *Wudeng huiyuan* and a mid-thirteenth-century Hangzhou gazetteer both give a name for the stūpa, "Five-Kinds-Not-Destroyed" 五種不壞 (ZZ 138. 596a; *Xianchun Linan zhi* 咸淳臨安志, j. 70, 9a).

one disciple, no disciple is given a biography in later lineage histories, and further dharma heirs, if any, are unknown.[129] Qisong may have foreseen the weak prospects of his line when, in a letter written later in life, he lamented that he had no followers.[130] (Curiously enough, we do know of a nephew, the son of a sister, who became a monk and played some role in preserving his writings).[131] Qisong did not foresee that the Yunmen school, flourishing and influential in the mid-to-late Northern Song, would soon fade from view. One wonders what, given seeming lack of interest in intra-Chan sectarianism, he would have made of this rapid decline in his own branch during a period when the Chan school as a whole remained strong.[132]

Though Qisong did not himself contribute a brood of dharma heirs to the continuation of Chan, through his writings, he did have influence far beyond his lifetime, within Chan circles and beyond. Given how frequently later authors refer to him, his writings must have been widely available. Even those who did not read his writing at length would have encountered several quotations from him in the very first section of the very popular *Chanlin baoxun* 禪林寶訓, a collection of sayings by Chan masters first compiled by Dahui Zonggao and then revised by Jingshan 淨善 (active 1174–1189).[133]

Qisong received a different sort of tribute from the Ming layman Zhu Shien 朱時恩. In the material prefacing his history of Buddhism, the *Fozu gangmu* 佛祖綱目, dated 1631, Zhu expresses his admiration for Qisong's historical works and recounts a dream in which he realized that he was in fact Qisong's reincarnation.[134]

---

[129] See Andō, "Butsunichi Meikyo Kaisū shikō," 127, on a disciple perhaps regarded as Qisong's dharma heir.

[130] *Collected Works*, 707a21. While his lack of heirs was, in Qisong's view, regrettable, he evinced nothing like the attitude found later in Japanese Zen that not producing an heir was "the sin of cutting off the Buddha seed" (Bodiford, "Dharma Transmission in Theory and Practice," 265).

[131] *Collected Works*, 746a16–17.

[132] As Schlütter notes, Qisong certainly did not anticipate the twelfth-century revival of the Caodong branch of Chan lineage (*How Zen Became Zen*, 79). The relatively rapid changes in the positions of the Yunmen and Caodong branches raise further questions about the very meaning of these "houses." Schlütter explains the rise of the Caodong as the result of the development of distinctive meditation and practice appealing to literati as well as the consolidation of lineage claims and patriarchal myths.

[133] T.48.2022.

[134] XZJ 85.1594.555b2, 556b14, 20, discussed by Zhang, *Beisong Qisong de Ru-Shi ronghui sixiang*, 339.

Far later, in the late eighteenth century and bespeaking an appeal to a far different audience, Qisong's *Collected Works* was selected for inclusion in the *Siku quanshu* 四庫全書 project of the Qing emperor Qianlong 乾隆 (r. 1736–1795). As R. Kent Guy explains, "The emperor's instructions were that the editors should include only such works as were necessary for reference. The Buddhist section of the catalog included only thirteen works."[135] Buddhist and Daoist literature was far from the focus of the project, but Qisong's inclusion is certainly still meaningful since "[v]irtually all of the books listed in the Buddhism section of the Ssu-k'u had been included in earlier book collections, and the selection could perhaps be regarded as the consensus of generations of bibliographers on 'What a well-educated emperor should know about Buddhism.'"[136] Even now, Qisong continues to be read, in Buddhist circles and beyond, showing up, for example, in an essay by the great modern author and critic Qian Zhongshu 錢鍾書.[137]

Conclusion

While reserving an examination of Qisong's composition of the *True Lineage* texts and campaign for their acceptance at court for the following chapter, the preceding account of his life reveals much that is significant. Despite a lack of family connections, he rose to prominence on the strength and passion of his writing. He was a man of his times, writing almost always in response to the intellectual and religious controversies already underway.

Despite his personal and intellectual involvement in Chan lineage, the facts of Qisong's life may also serve an excellent argument against an over-emphasis by scholars on differences between different schools and for recognition of a common culture in monastic Buddhism. In his reading, writing, and conversation with literati, Qisong is very much like his elite counterparts in other traditions of Chinese Buddhism. While the topics about which he read, wrote and discussed were often particular to Chan, he barely mentions the pursuit of an

[135] *The Emperor's Four Treasures: Scholars and the State in the Late Ch'ien-lung Era*, 111.
[136] Guy, 112.
[137] *Limited Views*, trans. Ronald Egan, 369.

enlightenment experience in distinctively Chan activities like master-disciple 'encounter dialogue' or meditation.

Not so surprisingly, when one considers 'real' families and other systems of affiliation, Qisong's association with fellow dharma heirs in the Yunmen lineage seems not to have been governed by the actual closeness of their genealogical relations; he and others seem to have gravitated to those within the larger group with whom they had additional affinities. Qisong was drawn to Yunmen 'dharma cousins' rather than 'dharma brothers' through shared interests in literary activity and Confucian thought. This interest also led him into constant interaction with literati, both Buddhist-identified and non-Buddhist, and with fellow Buddhist monastics, both Chan and non-Chan. His career illustrates the workings of a Chan lineage system in which networks of religious 'kin' cooperated in defending and developing their 'family' without necessarily sharing the 'style' of the lineage founder. Qisong's writings, for example, could not be farther from the "one-word barrier" identified as the characteristic of the Yunmen line in twelfth-century discussions of the "five houses of Chan."[138] Indeed, the accounts of master-disciple encounters analyzed in such typologies and considered typical of Chan (and one of its greatest contributions to Chinese Buddhism) are simply absent in his writings.

This suggests that in the Northern Song at least, the Chan school, like the Buddhist monastic establishment as a whole, made room for many different approaches and types. Thus Qisong could devote the bulk of his energy to writing rather than meditation, ritual practice, teaching or administration, and he could write about the lineage (but not the words and actions) of patriarchs as well as 'generic' Buddhist issues like the compatibility of Buddhism and other traditions and Buddhist relations with the state. Despite Qisong's own report that some of his fellow monks were uncomfortable with his involvement with non-Buddhist materials, his contemporaries in the Chan school seem to have been proud of him and grateful for the help of this scholar-monk in defending both Buddhism and Chan.

---

[138] Schlütter notes that the first extant list of the "five houses" of Guiyang, Caodong, Linji, Yunmen, and Fayan occurs in Qisong's *Record* but suspects that the scheme may predate him (*How Zen Became Zen*, 23). And in keeping with Schlütter's argument that during the Northern Song, the five houses indicated only one's descent and not a particular doctrinal stance (24–26), Qisong lists the five without describing particular teachings or styles of teaching.

Qisong's involvement in Confucian studies also suggests that he and some others defined themselves not in terms of a single religious or philosophical tradition that excluded contact with another, as some of his monastic peers preferred, but as the inheritors of the wisdom of many sages. When making reference to transmission within the Confucian tradition, Qisong surely seems to include himself. In this way, his life is a story of discovering and serving many sagely ancestors. The Buddha and the patriarchs descending from him are primary to Qisong's identity, but his defense of them does not preclude his respect and engagement with others whose teachings help people toward the Buddhist goals of morality, compassion, and wisdom. We can perhaps see in this reconfigured, less competitive attitude toward non-Buddhists a sign of the maturation of a confident Chinese Buddhist tradition, seemingly unthreatened by other traditions. Given that social, philosophical, and ethnic criticism of Buddhism was widespread at the time, this may also have been a wise strategy to adopt.

As we will see in the following chapters, Qisong did not look upon anti-Chan rhetoric from other Buddhists with the same sympathy. In this situation as well, however, Qisong presents his writing as a reaction to threats to 'his' tradition, 'his' ancestors, as a whole, and, as before, he proves to be both creative and bold in this conservative cause.

CHAPTER FOUR

"THE GREAT SUCCESSION IS NOT CLEAR": QISONG'S COMPOSITION OF THE *TRUE LINEAGE* TEXTS AND THE CAMPAIGN FOR THEIR ACCEPTANCE AT COURT

Introduction

For the period of Qisong's life from the mid-1040s through his success in the capital in the early 1060s, two questions are crucial: Why did he write the *True Lineage* texts, and how did he gain imperial approval for them? In answer to the first, I have reconstructed the specific circumstances that prompted Qisong's defense of Chan lineage in the form of the *True Lineage* texts. In particular, I describe the development of Tiantai criticism of Chan lineage and take into account conflicts within the Tiantai school that may have indirectly sharpened this criticism. The second question, that of Qisong's success at the imperial court, has attracted speculation, with some scholars arguing that the *True Lineage* texts won approval because they were bundled together with his 'Confucian' writings and others suggesting that Qisong unscrupulously curried favor with the state. Analyzing in detail the set of letters written by Qisong to the emperor and high court officials and constructing a chronology not only of Qisong's ultimate success but also of the content of the appeals he made to the court, I argue instead that Qisong's triumph in Kaifeng was not due to his Confucian writings but to his successful presentation of Chan lineage both as legitimate and an issue of importance to the court.

Qisong's composition of the *True Lineage* texts and his campaign on their behalf leads us into a host of related issues. These include the conflicts within literati culture and imperial policy-making about the value and place of Buddhism, the interaction of Buddhist institutions with the state, varieties of Buddhist sectarianism, and the complexity of religious and intellectual allegiances. Attention to this period also furthers our understanding of Qisong both as an individual and as a representative of Northern Song Buddhism, allowing us to extend the analysis of Qisong's intellectual disposition begun in the preceding chapter. We will see again that Qisong presents his writing as a

reaction to threats to 'his' tradition, whether defined as Buddhism as a whole or as the Chan school in particular. As before, he proves to be creative and bold in their defense. Qisong presents his writings on Buddhist-Confucian compatibility as a response to Confucian criticism of Buddhism and to the decline that criticism was prompting in both Buddhism and society; he identifies the motive for his composition of the *True Lineage* texts as distress over strife and misunderstanding of the true tradition. As he writes to Emperor Renzong, "If the great succession is not clear, those everywhere who practice the teachings of the Buddha will not attain one [part] of what he pointed to."[1]

The Catalyst for Composition

Although the *True Lineage* texts contain some indications that the history of the Chan school had long been of interest to Qisong, he did not begin to write on the topic until the early 1050s. He very likely began then in direct response to Tiantai critics of Chan lineage who were active in Hangzhou.

Members of the Tiantai school had been criticizing Chan lineage claims since at least the early Song. At that time, they mainly drew on traditional Buddhist doctrine and Tiantai interpretations of that doctrine to cast doubt on the possibility of 'a separate transmission outside the teachings'; they did not focus on the historical details of such a transmission. As Brook Ziporyn has argued, this doctrinal critique of Chan lineage was fueled not only by Tiantai rivalry with Chan for patronage and abbacies but also by a controversy within Tiantai, in which *shanjia* 山家, or 'home mountain,' figures accused *shanwai* 山外, or 'off mountain,' thinkers of falling prey to pernicious Huayan and Chan influence.[2]

We do not know exactly whose criticism of Chan lineage originally prompted Qisong to begin work on the *True Lineage* texts or even if

[1] "Shang huangdi shu" 上皇帝書, which precedes the *Record*, T.51.2078.715a17–18. This memorial letter also appears in a slightly different form in the *Collected Works*, T.52.2115.691a–c.

[2] "Anti-Chan Polemics in Post-Tang Tiantai," esp. 26–30. NB: *Shanwai* is a derogatory term used by opponents. For the term's history and meanings, see Getz, "Siming Zhili," 71–72. Scholars discussing the *shanjia/shanwai* controversy differ in how they characterize those involved, using terms like 'branch,' 'faction,' and 'movement.'

there was a particular spokesman for Tiantai criticism of Chan lineage. I have, however, identified a likely candidate for the position of outspoken critic: Nanping Fanzhen 南屏梵臻 (fl. 1028–1071), a leading disciple of the *shanjia* leader Siming Zhili 四明智禮 (960–1028).[3] Fanzhen was in Hangzhou as abbot of the Upper Tianzhu Monastery 上天竺寺 in 1051–52, before removing to Jinshan Monastery 金山寺 in Jiangsu for almost two decades.[4] It was Fanzhen who recommended the work of Shenqing (fl. 779–806), the Tang critic of the historicity of Chan lineage discussed earlier, to the official Shen Liao 沈遼 (c. 1031–c. 1084).[5] Shen read Shenqing's *Beishan lu* 北山錄 [Beishan Record], which had reportedly fallen into obscurity, and was sufficiently impressed to write a preface and publish the work.[6] Little is known

[3] I have found no dates for Nanping Fanzhen's 南屏梵臻 birth and death, but the thirteenth-century Tiantai historian Zongjian, author of the *Shimen zhengtong* 釋門正統, describes him becoming a disciple at the end of Zhili's life (XZJ 130.425d17), and Zhipan reports that Fanzhen went to study with Zhili immediately after receiving full precepts (*Fozu tongji*, T.49.2035.214c9). Since Zhili died in 1028, if Fanzhen went to him as a young man, Fanzhen was probably born no later than 1014 or so.

Su Shi met and admired Fanzhen in Hangzhou in the early 1070s, and when he returned in 1089 to serve as prefect, he lamented the fact that the monk had already died (Huang, "Elite and Clergy," 313). NB: Fanzhen's death is sometimes given as 1103, which I believe is a mistake probably based on the assumption that Fanzhen was still living when he was given an honorary title in that year. See *Fozu tongji*, T.49.2035.419a1–2.

As background to this dispute, it should be noted that once, when Fanzhen's teacher, the great *shanjia* leader Siming Zhili, happened to allude to a story about Bodhidharma found in Zongmi's writings, the Chan master Zining 子凝 (n.d.) wrote Zhili to protest that the story was not from a legitimate source. Zhili's reply demonstrates familiarity with and assessment of a variety of Chan writings, including a dismissal of the *Patriarchs Hall Collection* as biased in favor of Zongmi's writings. See Takao Giken 高雄義堅, *Sōdai Bukkyōshi no kenkyū* 宋代仏教史の研究, 77–80, and Foulk, "Controversies Concerning the 'Separate Transmission,'" 248–52.

[4] Zongjian and Zhipan do not tell us when Fanzhen returned to Hangzhou, only that he became abbot of Upper Tianzhu Monastery in 1051. He may have been in Hangzhou earlier, but as abbot of one of the most important monasteries in Hangzhou, he could certainly have made his opinions known.

[5] *Beishan lu* 北山錄, T.52.2113.573a. According to the *Songshi*, Shen Liao 沈遼 died at the end of the Yuanfeng period (1078–1085) at the age of 54 *sui*. For the biographies of Shen Gou 深遘 and Shen Liao, see *Songshi* 30.331.10652–3.

[6] Shen Liao's preface includes a tantalizing reference to Ding Wei 丁謂 (966–1037), a grand councilor in the early Song, being very fond of the *Beishan Record*. What little we know about Ding's involvement with Buddhism does not suggest a pattern of affiliation with a particular group. Ding wrote about Shengchang's 省常 (959–1020) pure land society (Huang Chi-chiang, "Elite and Clergy," 328, n. 8). According to Chan Chi-wah, Ding Wei was also involved with Jakushō 寂照, the eminent Tendai monk who studied with Genshin 源信 (942–1017) and then Zhili, and invited him to

about Shen Liao and his involvement with Buddhism, but he was the younger brother of Shen Gou 沈遘 (1028–1067), whose actions as prefect of Hangzhou in the early 1060s suggest that he may have favored—or at least given equal consideration to—monks with a 'Teaching' 教, i.e., Tiantai or Huayan, background as compared to those of the more numerous and popular Chan school.[7]

Shen Liao's preface to the *Beishan Record* does not mention Shenqing's questioning of certain Chan historical claims, but it is hard to imagine that Tiantai readers of the text would not have focused on them or that laymen with any knowledge of Chan lineage would not have remarked upon them.[8] Indeed, a re-discovery of Shenqing's writings might very well have prompted Tiantai adherents to add criticism of the weaknesses in the historical claims of Chan lineage to the early Song focus on doctrinal problems with Chan lineage that have been described by Ziporyn.[9]

---

stay in China ("Chih-li (960–1028) and the Formation of Orthodoxy," 251). See Ikesawa Jiko, trans. Zeng Zaozhuang, "Ding Wei nianpu" 丁謂年譜, 266–305.

[7] On the categories of Chan, 'Teaching' (教 *jiao*/講 *jiang*), and "Vinaya, see Takao, *Sōdai Bukkyōshi no kenkyū* 64–9; Foulk, "Myth, Ritual, and Monastic Practice," 163–7; and Schlütter, "Vinaya Monasteries, Public Abbacies, and State Control of Buddhism under the Song (960–1279)", 136–60.

As prefect, Shen Gou took the initiative to have the designation of the Upper Tianzhu Monastery switched from Chan to "teaching," with the specific appointment of Biancai Yuanjing 辯才元淨 (1011–1091), a second-generation dharma heir of the famed Tiantai master Ciyun Zunshi 慈雲遵式 (964–1032), as abbot. See Huang, "Elite and Clergy," 306–7; Koichi Shinohara, "From Local History to Universal History," 537–8; and Daniel Stevenson, "Protocols of Power," 350. Biancai later became a particular friend of Su Shi, even performing rituals to help Su's young son grow properly (Grant, *Mt. Lu Revisited*, 45, 69–72).

Shen Gou chose another prominent Tiantai monk, Biancai's dharma brother Haiyue Huibian 海月慧辯 (1014–1073), to be the monastic official for the local government. He also summoned the Huayan monk Jinshui Qingyuan 晉水淨源 (1011–1088), to Hangzhou to serve as abbot of a new monastery. See Huang, "Elite and Clergy," 310–2, 323–5. This last choice is interesting in that it suggests that if Shen Gou was deliberately trying to recognize masters of a variety of schools or possibly to avoid a Chan monopoly, he was unaffected by Tiantai animus against Huayan.

[8] I have been unable to determine when Shen Liao met Fanzhen. As both were natives of Hangzhou, they probably met there, but I do not know when. The chronology of their interaction is complicated by the fact that although Shen Liao's preface to the *Beishan Record* is dated 1068, in it, Shen refers to Fanzhen as Nanping, although Fanzhen did not become abbot of a monastery on Mt. Nanping until 1071. I have been unable to discover if Fanzhen spent time at Nanping in his earlier years, prior to serving as abbot. Once at Nanping, however, he received many visits from Su Shi (Grant, *Mt. Lu Revisited*, 64).

[9] I have found no mention of Shenqing or his writings in Zhili's writings as pre-

Vying for *Shifang* Designation

A re-discovery of Shenqing would have been particularly welcome given the practical, political reason mid-eleventh-century Tiantai monks had to raise doubts about the legitimacy of Chan lineage: an escalating contest to have the state designate monasteries as *shifang* 十方, or "ten directions," i.e., 'public.'[10] Such monasteries were usually large institutions, often receiving significant state support, at which the abbot was chosen from among the members of a specific school, rather than being chosen privately from among the personal disciples of the preceding abbot, as was the custom at most so-called 'hereditary' or 'vinaya' monasteries. In either case, state officials took part in the selection of the new abbot, but their role seems to have been more central in the selection of abbots at public monasteries. Morten Schlütter has argued that state officials favored the public monastery system for the increased control it gave them while many monks saw in it both the advantage of increased government support and exemption from the periodic imperial edicts against unregistered monasteries without imperially-bestowed name plaques.[11] Daniel Getz's examination of Zhili's campaign to have a monastery recognized as a public monastery dedicated to Tiantai teachings reveals as well a desire to avoid either a slide toward the corruption and mediocrity frequently seen in 'hereditary' succession or the possibility of control of Tiantai monasteries being transferred to other schools.[12]

---

served in the Taishō, v. 46, but in Shen's preface, Fanzhen refers to an "old master" praising the work. Whether this old master is Zhili or another monk is unclear.

Takao notes that in the biography of the Korean monk Uich'on 義天 (1055–1101), both the *Shimen zhengzong* and the *Fozu tongji* quote a postscript to the collected works of Feishan Jiezhu, which mentions an *yixue* 義學 monk named Quanxiao who, under the Liao emperor Daozong (r. 1055–1101), was given the task of establishing the authenticity of Buddhist texts and consigned the *Platform Sūtra* and *Baolin zhuan* to destruction (*Shimen zhengtong*, XZJ 130.451c–d; *Fozu tongji*, T.49.2035.223; *Sōdai Bukkyōshi no kenkyū* 88–9).

[10] Takao, *Sōdai Bukkyōshi no kenkyū*, 57–74. Getz summarizes and expands Takao's research in the case of Zhili ("Siming Zhili and Tiantai Pure Land in the Song Dynasty," 130–58). See also the comments of Foulk, "Myth, Ritual, and Monastic Practice," 163–7, who dates it to the Five Dynasties and also Schlütter, "Vinaya Monasteries, Public Abbacies, and State Control of Buddhism under the Song (960–1279)."

[11] "Vinaya Monasteries, Public Abbacies, and State Control of Buddhism under the Song (960–1279)," 139.

[12] Takao, *Sōdai Bukkyōshi no kenkyū*, 62; Getz, "Siming Zhili," chap. 5.

The origins of the institutional innovation of 'public' monasteries are not entirely clear. A number of scholars, most recently Daniel Getz, speculate that it began at "Chan monasteries" in Jiangxi and Hunan in the late Tang or early Five Dynasties as an alternative to traditional master-disciple succession.[13] Schlütter points out that the public monastery did not become a legal category until the Northern Song.[14] Chan monasteries in the early Song gained official approval for the system and Tiantai monasteries soon followed. Given the energy with which the designation was pursued, the prestige, support, and security it offered must have been thought to outweigh the apparent loss of monastic autonomy.

For our purposes, the competition to have a monastery named 'public' in a certain tradition or to have the affiliation of a public monastery switched undoubtedly served as an impetus for monks to find fault with the lineage claims of their rivals and to bolster their own claims. In particular, if Tiantai monks could impugn 'Chan ancestors' as frauds and undermine the basis on which Chan lineage served to provide abbots for many prominent, prosperous monasteries, they might win for themselves those institutions and the patronage that came with them. And, as Foulk has noted, "Once association with the Ch'an lineage became a ticket to high office in the leading public monasteries of the Sung, there was naturally an increase in the number of powerful monks who had a vested interest in upholding the historicity of the accounts in the genealogical histories."[15] We can see these issues played out in relation to Fanzhen, who served as abbot of the Upper Tianzhu Monastery, a Hangzhou institution whose abbots had earlier been Chan dharma heirs and starting with Fanzhen began to alternate between prominent Chan and Tiantai teachers depending on the preferences of the local officials.[16]

Unlike the system of direct master-disciple succession in 'hereditary' temples, which more closely resembles property inheritance in 'real' families, the state-mediated 'public' abbacy, based on more general lineage membership, combines an element of affiliation with

[13] Getz, "Siming Zhili," 134, n. 17, 154, n. 71. See also Foulk, "Myth, Ritual, and Monastic Practice," 164–5.

[14] "Vinaya Monasteries, Public Abbacies, and State Control of Buddhism under the Song (960–1279)," 143.

[15] Foulk, "Controversies Concerning the 'Separate Transmission,'" 223.

[16] Huang, "Elite and Clergy," 305–6.

official evaluation and recommendation. The parallel to the selection of most state officials is striking. Although the Northern Song state made an attempt to regulate monastics through exams, as had previous dynasties, it did not succeed. Instead, it relied on recommendation and encouraged, through the requirements of 'public' abbacies, a circulation of abbots. Just as state officials were not to serve in their own hometowns, in order to avoid the creation of private fiefdoms by locally powerful families, eminent monks were discouraged from building too strong a base of power by staying at one monastery their whole lives. Not surprisingly, corruption still found its way into monasteries when abbots with no particular loyalty to the institution served a few years and then left, their pockets lined with monastery wealth.[17]

In the mid-eleventh century, the most recent claims of dharma transmission were fairly well-documented, and the clash between Tiantai and Chan focused on the much hazier Indian stretch of the lineage. Tiantai monks held up the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* and its account of a dharma transmission that ended in India, with the violent death of the twenty-fourth heir as proof that it was impossible that Bodhidharma was a direct dharma heir in an unbroken line. As we saw earlier, Tiantai lineage claims describe transhistorical transmission through a Chinese monk who gained great insight while reading the work of Nāgārjuna, the fourteenth dharma heir, thus initiating a new line of dharma transmission in China. Tiantai could therefore assert its own authority without contradicting the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury*.

In retrospect, this debate is a hollow one, since both sides rely on sources of questionable authority.[18] But the arguments themselves tell us a great deal about religiously significant attitudes toward history. These arguments also veer frequently into otherwise rare discussions of the self-conception of the group involved. Indeed, the specific challenge of Tiantai criticism provoked Qisong to a vigorous response in

---

[17] Schlütter, *How Zen Became Zen*, 39–40.

[18] For scholarly evaluations of the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* and of Qisong's condemnation of it, see Henri Maspero, "Sur la date et l'authenticité du Fou fatsang yin yuan tchouan"; my paper, "The Curious Fate of an Early Medieval Chinese Buddhist Text: Reconsidering the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan*"; Wendi Adamek, *The Mystique of Transmission*, and Stuart Young, "Conceiving the Indian Buddhist Patriarchs in China," Chapter Three. On the *Meditation Sutra* and *Chu sanzang ji ji* as sources for Chan lineage, see Chapter Six, in which the criticisms of Shenqing and Zifang 子昉 are discussed.

which he presented a more elaborate vision of Chan lineage and identity than had been previously articulated as will be discussed in following chapters. For now, let me repeat Penkower's observation, made in connection to her work on early Tiantai lineage construction, that the conception of the lineage frequently reflects the meaning and substance it was believed to transmit.[19] In the case at hand, although Chan and Tiantai adherents were competing for same prize of *shifang* designation, they presented not just different figures in the same pattern but strikingly different visions of lineage.

The War of Words Begins

Whether the source was Fanzhen or not, the criticism of Chan lineage that prompted Qisong to respond seems to have been confined to talk, and we must rely on Qisong himself for information about its content.[20] All three *True Lineage* works refute Tiantai criticism, each in its own way. Two of the works present Chan lineage as Qisong understands it; the *Chart Establishing the Patriarchs* presents in visual form with brief captions the Indian patriarchs and the first six Chinese patriarchs, and the *Record of the True Lineage*, describes Chan lineage up to the generation of Qisong's master.[21] The *Record* quite strikingly omits biographical information for all but the early patriarchs whose legitimacy was in question. Later generations are simply listed, name after name after name, in Biblical 'begat' fashion. Qisong certainly does not describe these later dharma heirs in the sort of detail that would allow them to serve as models of behavior. The text simply is not intended for that purpose.

---

[19] Penkower, "In the Beginning," 260–8.

[20] None of the biographical material on Fanzhen mentions any writing by him, and an official judging him in relation to the prolific Renyue 仁岳 praised Fanzhen for doctrinal knowledge and Renyue for literary skill (Chan, "Chih-li (960–1028) and the Formation of Orthodoxy," 267; Huang, "Elite and Clergy," 313).

[21] Although a text portion of the *Chart* survives, the actual chart does not. We do have a notion of how it looked, thanks to a sketch done by a Japanese copyist and reproduced in the Taishō (Zuzō 10.1409–34).

Because the *True Lineage* texts do not provide additional information about the most recent generations of dharma heirs, they are often left out of lists of 'transmission of the lamp' texts, and later compilations, e.g. *Wudeng huiyuan*, do not draw on them as major sources.

Furthermore, Qisong seems not to be justifying his own line or his own master, as many of his predecessors in the genre did, but instead justifying the whole Chan tradition—and in his mind the whole Buddhist religion. In other words, he is not addressing rivals within the Chan school but critics without. For Chan readers, he is providing a sort of reference work rather than a collection of exemplary lives or enlightening exchanges between masters and disciples. One might argue that he meant for Chan readers to turn to the *Jingde Record of the Transmission of the Lamp* of 1004 or the *Tiansheng guangdeng lu* [Tiansheng Extensive Record of the Lamp] of 1036 for the stories that make Chinese dharma heirs come to life, but he never gives such directions. Qisong says explicitly that he is picking up where the *Jingde Record of the Transmission of the Lamp*, the *Tiansheng Extensive Record of the Lamp*, and the *Song Biographies of Eminent Monks* leave off, and yet when presenting the generation beyond that covered in the *Tiansheng*, he provides only the most basic of information.[22] This confirms that the impetus to compose seems to have been to resolve the issue of the Indian patriarchs and then link them to the present generation as expeditiously as possible, not to redress more recent issues. Foulk observes that Qisong does seem to tighten up recent generations, winnowing out some figures, but unfortunately, Qisong does not explain or justify these decisions, making it difficult for us to understand why and on what basis he took this action.[23]

The third *True Lineage* work, the *Critical Essay*, was sometimes regarded as an extension or appendix to the *Record*. Its first half, in particular, can be viewed as the continuation of comments Qisong makes in the *pingyue* 評曰, or 'critical comments,' that appear regularly throughout the *Record*.[24] This first half of the *Critical Essay*, considered at length in the next chapter, contains a more direct response to Tiantai criticism, serving as it does to justify historiographical choices made in the *Record*. The second half, discussed in Chapter Six, consists of more general questions and answers about a number of Chan claims. In the *Critical Essay*, Qisong directs his ire at three targets: the

[22] *Record*, T.51.2078.749a14–21. As noted in the previous chapter, Qisong represents an aspect of Chan distinct from collectors of *gong'an* and *yulu*. His only known involvement with *yulu* was his work on the *Platform Sūtra*, a typically 'conservative' interest.

[23] Foulk, "Chan Myths," 72.

[24] Zhang Qingyuan also makes the argument that *pingyue* led to the composition of the *Critical Essay* (*Beisong Qisong de Ru-Shi ronghui sixiang*, 247–8).

Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury (and those who rely on it), Shenqing, and Chan monks whose ignorance or negligence have allowed doubts to arise. He reports that 'exegetical monks' say that Bodhidharma did not inherit the dharma as the twenty-eighth in a line of Indian patriarchs.[25] Relying on the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* and its account of a line of twenty-four Indian patriarchs that came to an end with the violent death of Siṃha, these monks reject as "a deceptive story of later men" the notion that Bodhidharma received the transmission.[26]

Qisong, despite protestations of objective research into the issue—"I investigated the two accounts, wanting, with all humility, to determine the truth"—sets himself the task of undermining the legitimacy of the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury*.[27] He describes it not as the translation of an Indian text but as a deeply flawed and incomplete collection of material pieced together from a variety of sources. He points out lacunae and internal inconsistencies. To piece together a more accurate and complete account of the dharma transmission, he turns to other sources, particularly the *Chu sanzang ji ji* [Collection of notes on the translation of the Tripitaka], written by the highly esteemed Sengyou 僧祐 (435–518) and, without much acknowledgment, the *Baolin zhuan*.

Qisong also challenges Shenqing, whose opinions—on why Bodhidharma came to China, why dharma transmission need not be the basis of a school, and how the Chan patriarch Bodhidharma is based on the conflation of different historical figures—Qisong finds highly objectionable. He addresses them in the *Critical Essay* as well as in a commentary appended to the biography of an Indian patriarch in the *Record* itself.[28]

---

[25] As Chi-wah Chan notes, the term *yixue zhe* 義學者 is strongly associated with Tiantai monks as a hagiographical category ("Chih-li (960–1028) and the Formation of Orthodoxy," 389, n. 11). Since Qisong never used the term 'Tiantai' or names particular living opponents in his extant writings, this is as specific as he gets.

[26] *Critical Essay*, 773c7–8. Qisong does not refer to Shenqing until much later, but his description of the comments of the exegetical monks paraphrases closely Shenqing's comments on Chan lineage and share the expression *qushuo* 曲說, or "deceptive story" (*Beishan Record*, 611b22).

[27] *Critical Essay*, 773c10.

[28] *Critical Essay*, 725a–c, and *Record*, 725a–c. A version of the latter piece also appears separately in his collected works (*Collected Works*, 721b–c) under the title "Letter Evaluating the *Beishan* [*Record*] of the Honorable [Shen]qing," suggesting that it may have circulated separately. The slight differences between the two versions do

Qisong does not direct all his criticism at the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* or Shenqing. He also reproaches the ignorant monks of his own school who, by creating and passing on errors, created difficulties for the future. He then ends the first part of the *Critical Essay* with an outline of the *Record*.[29]

In short, as I reconstruct it, Tiantai criticism of the historicity of Chan lineage, perhaps voiced by Fanzhen and almost certainly alluding to Shenqing's objections, prompted Qisong to compose the *Record*, the *Chart*, and the first part of the first fascicle of the *Critical Essay*. Exactly when Qisong wrote these is unclear. His biographer and friend Chen Shunyu says simply that Qisong wrote them in the Huangyou era (1049–54).[30] How widely the texts circulated is unknown, but they did attract criticism to which Qisong, in time, responded.

Perhaps because of continuing criticism of Chan lineage and perhaps because of his own desire for firmer evidence, Qisong was unsatisfied with what he had been able to prove. Seven years later, when he encountered the *Meditation Sutra* [i.e., the *Damoduoluo chanjing* discussed in Chapter One], he believed he had found incontrovertible evidence of the continuation of the lineage beyond the twenty-fourth Indian generation and wrote the rest of the *Critical Essay*.[31] In this continuation of the text, he admits at the outset that earlier he had not been able to end the dispute and so was excited to present a new piece of evidence that would, he believed, put all doubts to rest. His confidence in the *Meditation Sutra* prompts him to discount the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* entirely. He goes so far as to call for its destruction by fire: "I say this erroneous book can be burnt."[32] We may regard this as the moment in the debate when Qisong first

---

not suggest a chronology of revision, however, and the history of the piece remains elusive.

[29] He also notes that the *Record* and the *Chart* were carved, presumably in woodblocks, in twelve *juan*, perhaps a reference to the private printing of these works in Suzhou in 1064.

[30] *Collected Works*, 648b17–8. A further confirmation of this time frame is Qisong's comment in a 1062 letter that the True Lineage texts have taken ten years of his life ("Chong shang Han Xianggong shu" 重上韓相公書, *Collected Works*, 693a16–7).

[31] *Critical Essay*, 776a3–5.

[32] *Critical Essay*, 777c10. When later annotating his works, Qisong felt the need to clarify that by "this erroneous book," he meant the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury*. Careless readers perhaps thought that he meant instead the *Meditation Sutra* or the *Chu sanzang ji ji*, which are mentioned in the previous line, and were scandalized that anyone dare impugn such respected works.

appeals to the power of the state, in its role as the gatekeeper for the Buddhist canon, to intervene.

The exact date of Qisong's elaboration of his argument in the rest of the *Critical Essay* is elusive, as are the details of its circulation. It was probably between 1059 and 1061. We do know that its appearance provoked a Tiantai monk named Zifang 子昉 to reply with an essay entitled "Zu shuo" 祖說 [On Patriarchs].

The Critic Zifang

We know little about Zifang. None of his writings survive, save for one passage from "On Patriarchs" preserved in the *Fozu tongji* 佛祖通紀 [Comprehensive History of the Buddhas and the Patriarchs], a history by the Tiantai monk Zhipan 志磐 (fl. 1258–1269).[33] Zifang might have sunk into obscurity in any event, but a contributing factor was undoubtedly his membership in the later 'off-mountain' line of Tiantai. Zifang's master, Renyue Jingjue 仁岳淨覺 (992–1064), began his career as a loyal follower of Zhili, the major voice of the home-mountain position. Renyue composed at least three rebuttals of off-mountain doctrine, but in the mid-1020s, he wrote an essay raising doubts about one of Zhili's doctrinal positions and then left Zhili's monastery.[34] The sources give two different explanations, not necessarily exclusive, for Renyue's sudden change of heart. One is that he was slighted by Zhili in a doctrinal dispute with a dharma-brother (to whose line the historian Zhipan belonged).[35] Zhipan also describes Renyue recovering from an illness, possibly induced by over-exertion during intensive ritual and meditative practice, when he suddenly declared that he had been wrong in espousing certain views.[36] Whatever the reason, Renyue in effect shifted to the off-mountain group, which was distinguished by an interest in Huayan thought.[37]

---

[33] Following the translation offered by Albert Welter ("A Buddhist Response to the Confucian Revival," 31).

[34] See Getz, "Siming Zhili," 71–128, 217–27; Chan, "Chih-li," 263–78; Andō Toshio 安藤俊雄, *Tendaigaku ronshū* 天台学論集, 398–432.

[35] Chan, "Chih-li," 266.

[36] Getz, "Siming Zhili," 218.

[37] Chi-wah Chan's 1993 UCLA dissertation and Getz's 1994 Yale dissertation both take up aspects of the Shanjia-Shanwai conflict in the early Song.

Despite this doctrinal defection from Zhili and home-mountain position, Renyue remained well within the Tiantai fold.[38] When he left Zhili's monastery, Yanqing Monastery 延慶院, he went to stay with Ciyun Zunshi 慈雲遵式 (964–1032), another great early Song Tiantai master and a longtime friend of Zhili, with whom Zunshi had studied under Uit'ong 義通 (927–988). This defection took him from the home mountain of Tiantai to Hangzhou, where he spent much of the rest of his life as abbot of various monasteries. Nevertheless, home-mountain animus against Renyue remained strong, most obviously on the part of Fanzhen, the monk responsible for introducing Shenqing's *Beishan Record* to Shen Liao, who wrote a preface and had the work printed. Fanzhen, as a younger disciple of Zhili, whether or not he had known Renyue at Yanqing Monastery, might very well have regarded him as an older brother who had abandoned their father and even antagonized him during the last days of his life.

Tiantai histories report that Fanzhen and Renyue planned a public debate "in the Indian style," with the loser punished by death.[39] A local official supposedly headed off the confrontation by naming Fanzhen superior in doctrinal knowledge and Renyue superior in literary skill.[40] These individual judgments seem beside the point in an internal Tiantai controversy, but, in truth, the whole account is somewhat dubious.[41]

To return to Zifang, he would probably be no more than a name in the list of Renyue's disciples had he not possessed the temerity to attack Qisong and the validity of Chan lineage.[42] Indeed, as far as biographical detail, we know only his hometown and his honorary

---

[38] Penkower notes that "the Sung historians themselves show that there was more fluidity and less rancor between these two groups than their names imply" ("Making and Remaking Tradition," 1336 (3)).

[39] Chen Jinhua has suggested that a possible source for this sort of public debate might be Xuanzang's biography, T.50.2052.217b2–3.

[40] See Chan, "Chih-li," 267.

[41] Huang Chi-chiang expresses suspicion of the account, speculating that it was affected by later efforts to clarify lineage ("Elite and Clergy," 313). To my mind, the account is too unclear to serve this purpose.

[42] Later Tiantai historians who are the only source of information on him are thus in an awkward position; they clearly approve of his response to Qisong, and yet they exclude him from Tiantai lineage per se. Zongjian places him among 'dharma protectors' like Tanluan, Sengchou, Yanshou, and Uich'on, rather than among 'those who attack the *zongtu*, or path of the principles' (see Chan, "Chih-li," 362). Zhipan puts him in a section of miscellaneous biographies that follows the presentation of the lineage and does not mention him when attacking his master Renyue as a betrayer

title.[43] Since he "early depended on [Renyue] Jingjue" and was for a time his leading disciple, we must look to his master's life for information about Zifang's probable dates, whereabouts, and loyalties.[44] This is, of course, a curious twist on the observation made in the last chapter that Chan dharma transmission need not be based on a long-standing relationship between master and disciple. Without overstating the significance of the cases of Qisong and Zifang, however, we may observe that the meaning and basis of lineage differs in different schools and at different times and that Tiantai master-disciple relationships are frequently based on long years of study and practice, in large part because the 'inheritance' is largely one of training in orthodoxy and orthopraxy. In short, it seems that Zifang probably spent many years with Renyue in Hangzhou.

It also seems likely that the antagonistic, argumentative intra-Tiantai skirmishes in which Renyue participated prepared Zifang for his role in the controversy about Chan lineage. Indeed, in addition to encouraging an inclination to confrontation, the Tiantai conflict may have taught Zifang about issues of textual authenticity, for, as with Chan lineage, the struggle within Tiantai concerned the legitimacy of key texts and was argued in terms of internal consistency and coherence.[45] Thus, despite the antagonism between Fanzhen and Renyue, Fanzhen and Renyue's disciple Zifang may very well have found common cause in criticizing Chan lineage.

According to the Tiantai history *Shimen zhengtong* 釋門正統 [Orthodox Lineage of the Buddhist Tradition] by Zongjian 宗鑑, dated 1237, it was Qisong's *Chart* and *Record*—particularly his use of the *Meditation Sutra* and the *Baolin zhuan*—and its literally inflammatory state-

of Tiantai and exhorting readers not to study other schools, especially Huayan and Weishi.

[43] He came from Wuxing 吳興, also known as Huzhou 湖州, a Zhejiang city just south of Lake Tai.

[44] *Fozu tongji* T.49.2035.242a3. Zongjian calls Zifang a *gao dizi* 高弟子, or eminent disciple, of Renyue (XZJ 130.445b5), and Zhipan lists him first among Renyue's seven heirs (T.49.2035.241a, 257). In Renyue's biography, however, Zongjian gives the names of four other disciples, suggesting that Zifang predeceased his master, left the community, or otherwise lost his standing before Renyue's death (XZJ 130.421d14–15; see Chan, "Chih-li," 384–5). Zhipan mentions only two of the four disciples Zongjian lists, suggesting either significant uncertainty about Renyue's disciples or later alteration of the text for unknown reasons (T.49.2035.241b29). See Huang, "Elite and Clergy," 334–35, n. 64, for a summary of Renyue's career.

[45] Chan, "Chih-li," 87, 204–6.

ment concerning the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* that outraged Zifang.[46] His response, "On Patriarchs," does not survive, but it very likely served as the impetus for Qisong to keep looking for evidence, to keep writing, and perhaps even to travel to the capital in 1061 with the explicit purpose of gaining acceptance into the imperial canon for both the *True Lineage* texts and the *Essays to Aid the Teaching.*

We know too little to speculate with any degree of confidence, but it is still worth pondering for a moment what made Qisong seek imperial approval of his scheme of Chan lineage. Was he hoping to consolidate an already strong position in the court of Hangzhou opinion? Or was he trying for imperial approval precisely because he was not finding success in the Buddhist and official circles of Hangzhou? Was he emboldened by his imperially-awarded purple robe?

The Letter-Writing Campaign and Trip to the Capital

We know of Qisong's concerted effort to present his writings at court through a set of letters and memorial letters he wrote to officials and the emperor.[47] Though the correspondence is unfortunately one-sided, we do know that Qisong's missives had the intended effect of securing imperial approval for his writings.

Mark Halperin, in his study of inscriptions written for Buddhist monasteries by literati from the late Tang through the Song, notes that the literati side of associations between literati and monks is better known since "[e]xtant sources permit but the barest glimpse of the clergy's perspective."[48] Qisong's letters do not shed light on the usual scene—"reclusive" monks frequently visited at their monasteries by literati—but they do show one monk actively making his way in the

---

[46] Qisong calls for the burning of the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* in the *Record*, 725b26–9. Takao notes that Qisong was the first to turn to the *Meditation Sutra* to support Chan lineage, an issue I will take up in the next chapter (*Sōdai Bukkyōshi no kenkyū*, 86).

[47] While Qisong's missives to Renzong are memorial letters in the classic sense, the rest of the correspondence is harder to categorize, and aside from his initial appeal to Han Qi, I will refer to them as letters because they are less formal and more personal.

[48] Halperin, "Pieties and Responsibilities," 4, n. 9. Perhaps only the *Guoqing bailu* (T.46.1934), which includes correspondence between Zhiyi and a Sui emperor, is comparable in the history of Chinese Buddhism to this set of letters.

world of officials. Of particular interest in these letters are how Qisong represents himself, what he asks for, upon what he bases his appeal, whom he identifies as opponents, and how he presents the state-Buddhist relationship.

In laying out the rivalry between Chan and Tiantai, I have already discussed the matter of public monasteries. But, to our knowledge, Qisong did not compete in this arena, at least not directly. Instead, he strove for success in another major area of state support for Buddhist schools, inclusion in the imperial Buddhist canon. While individual Buddhist texts, both traditional and newly composed, were frequently printed privately, only the state had the resources to print and distribute the massive collection of sutras, commentaries, treatises, and other material deemed worthy of imperial attention (and at times even the state was unable to afford this undertaking). Financial wherewithal thus dovetailed with the state's interest in both controlling the content of the Buddhist canon and benefiting from the merit created by its printing.[49]

Having consulted the early Song imperial canon at a number of different monastery libraries, Qisong was well aware that inclusion in it might ensure the survival of a work and that the imperial imprimatur was itself a powerful symbol. The previous few generations of the Chan and Tiantai schools had sought inclusion for important texts; the *Jingde Record of the Transmission of the Lamp* and the *Tiansheng Extensive Record of the Lamp* are, in fact, clear symbols of Chan success at court. Tiantai monks succeeded in having Zhiyi's writings admitted in 1026 but failed to achieve the same for other Tiantai works.[50]

The Atmosphere in Kaifeng

Over the course of the eleventh century, long-standing ideological conflicts among the literati and officials had resulted in a situation of factionalism between the so-called 'reformist' group led by Ouyang Xiu (1007–1072) and linked but not identical to the *guwen* literary movement and the 'conservative' opposition voicing frequent objec-

[49] Huang Chi-chiang, "Imperial Rulership and Buddhism in the Early Northern Sung," 149–58.

[50] Yanagida Seizan, "Dai zōkyō to zenroku no nyūzo," 533.

tions. In the early 1060s, when Qisong made his journey to the capital, the reformists were in power. It is important to stress that these groups were not monolithic, especially on the issue of Buddhism. Scholars have often attributed rigidly 'anti-Buddhist' attitudes to a number of officials and thinkers whose views were in fact more complex and often more sympathetic. Likewise, a number of 'pro-Buddhist' officials proposed reforms of the Buddhist monastic community, like limits on monastery-building and the number of ordinations, which might be perceived as persecution.

Huang Chi-chiang has written on this subject, and others have also taken up the issue of literati interaction with Buddhist institutions.[51] A more nuanced view of literati attitudes to and involvement in Buddhism also opens the way for a less simplistic understanding of monastic Buddhists themselves, who also evinced a variety of attitudes toward the state. Elite monks like Qisong often shared the concerns of officials about corruption and lowered standards within the sangha; Huang has noted that Zanning, for example, thought the number of ordinations in his day excessive.[52]

It is similarly difficult to deliver a clear-cut description of Renzong's attitude toward Buddhism, especially as it may have changed over a long reign that began under a regent.[53] We can identify, however, some salient issues and traits. He seems to have been open to ongoing learning, as seen in his decision to extend his own education into adulthood by continuing 'classics mat' seminars in a public space.[54] As Marie Guarino shows, for an adult emperor to have regular lectures was an innovation. He also spent time with prominent monks, most notably two Chan monks, Huayan Daolong 華嚴道隆 (fl. 1040s–1050s), a Linji lineage heir, and Dajue Huailian 大覺懷璉 (1009–1090), a Yunmen heir, whom he rewarded with honorary titles.[55]

---

[51] "Experiment in Syncretism," 101–11. For research on this question from varying angles and for different periods, see Halperin, *Out of the Cloister*; Timothy Brook, *Praying for Power*, and Robert M. Gimello, "Mārga and Culture."

[52] Imperial Rulership," 180, n. 78.

[53] While further research is necessary, the evidence suggests that Renzong, like many emperors, was quite willing to praise a variety of religious traditions while at the same time worrying about and sometimes acting to curb the financial and institutional strength of Buddhist and Daoist groups.

[54] Marie Guarino, "Learning and Imperial Authority in Northern Sung China (960–1126): The Classics Mat lectures," 10–12.

[55] Huang Chi-chiang, "Imperial Rulership," 161, 183, n. 94; Huang Min-chih, *Song Fojiao shehui jingji shi lunji*, 443–60.

Renzong was undoubtedly aware that preceding Song emperors had supported a number of Buddhist projects, like an effort to collect and translate previously unknown Indian texts.[56] He also knew that they also made efforts to bring the *sangha* more firmly under state control. While a thorough study of his attitudes toward Buddhism has yet to be done, he does not seem to have strayed from the path taken by his predecessors, one of support and control, punctuated occasionally by grand gestures of patronage and generally unsuccessful attempts to force the sangha to conform to the will of the state.[57]

It is also worth noting that Renzong's extended family also included devout and deeply involved lay Buddhists like his uncle Li Zunxu, author of the 1036 Chan lineage text, *Tiansheng Extensive Record of the Lamp*, and his cousin, Li Duanyuan, who, as mentioned earlier, recommended Qisong for the purple robe he received.

The First Barrage of Letters

The campaign to introduce Qisong's writings to the imperial court began with an admirer, Cui Huangchen 崔黄臣, presenting Qisong's letters and copies of the *Essays to Aid the Teaching* to a handful of officials with whom Qisong had some acquaintance or who were known to be committed lay Buddhists.[58] Between mid-1058 and late 1060, Cui, an 'Erudite of the National University,' presented the *Essays to Aid the Teaching* and letters to four high court officials.[59] One of these officials, Zhang Fangping 張方平 (1007–1091), had served as pre-

---

[56] See Tansen Sen, *Buddhism, Diplomacy, and Trade: The Realignment of Sino-Indian Relations, 600–1400*, 110–25, for the most comprehensive overview in English of the history and vicissitudes of the Institute. See also Richard Bowring, "Buddhist Translations in the Northern Sung" and Jan Yün-hua, "Ch'uan-fa Yuan: The Imperial Institute for Transmission of Buddha-dharma in Sung China."

[57] Huang Chi-chiang, "Imperial Rulership," 161, 182, n. 89.

[58] While none of the fourteen letters bears a date, I have been able to reconstruct a detailed chronology from internal evidence. See "Authority, Ancestors, and History," 266–70.

[59] See *Collected Works*, "Shang Zhang Duanming shu" 上張端明書, 694b–c; "Shang Tian Shumi shu" 上田樞密書, 694c–695a; "Shang Zeng Canzheng shu"上曾参政書, 695a–c; and "Shang Zhao Nei Han shu" 上趙内翰書, 695c–696a. For Cui's title, see 696c3. In connection to Zhao, note that Qisong addresses him with the title 'Nei Han,' indicating a member of the Hanlin Academy, a group of educated men working as writers and editors within the court, and not a member of the Xueshi yuan, or Institute of Academicians, a related group often referred to as Hanlin. See Charles O. Hucker, *A Dictionary of Official Titles in Imperial China*, 223, 253.

fect of Hangzhou in the early 1050s and already read a piece included in the *Essays to Aid the Teaching*; another, Tian Kuang 田況 (1005–1063), was given ten copies of the text, presumably so that he could distribute it widely. The others were Zeng Gongliang 曾公亮 (999–1078), a high court official, and Zhao Gai 趙概 (996–1083), a senior Hanlin academician.[60] Around the same time, a monk whom Qisong does not identify also gave the *Essays to Aid the Teaching* and an accompanying letter to Lü Zhen 呂臻 (fl. 1038–61), a former member of the Hanlin Academy, with whom Qisong became acquainted during Lü's tenure as prefect of Hangzhou.[61]

While these five letters differ according to Qisong's knowledge of the recipient, the same elements appear repeatedly. Qisong describes writing the *Essays to Aid the Teaching* to "counter the *ru* of the world who do not know the Buddha as a great sage."[62] He rails against "the writings of literary men that reject Buddhism."[63] They fail to see that the "path [of the Buddha] saves all the beings in the world, and his dharma covertly contributes to civilizing the country."[64] They overlook the "secret aid of the Buddhist teachings."[65] As a result, when Qisong warns that "[t]he dharma of our sage is on the verge of being abandoned and destroyed," he also implies that the state will lose an important source of support.[66]

Qisong then alludes to a sutra that says that the Buddha entrusted the dharma to kings and ministers.[67] He flatters the recipient with praise for his wisdom and perspicuity and asks for help. He proclaims

---

On Zhang Fangping's Buddhist inclinations and activities, see Huang, "Experiment in Syncretism," 97–100, and Grant, *Mt. Lu Revisited*, 133. On Zhao Gai, see Huang, "Experiment in Syncretism," 99–100.

[60] Huang Chi-chiang notes the large donation of money and scriptures that Gong, a member of a family with strong Buddhist connections, made in 1065 to the reconstruction of the Upper Tianzhu Monastery ("Elite and Clergy," 307, 336 n. 81).

[61] *Collected Works*, "Shang Lü Nei Han shu" 上呂內翰書, 696a–b. On Lü, see Huang, "Elite and Clergy," 306–7.

[62] *Collected Works*, 694b28–9.

[63] *Collected Works*, 694c27.

[64] *Collected Works*, 694b29–c1.

[65] *Collected Works*, 695b11–12.

[66] *Collected Works*, 694c22.

[67] Although Qisong does not name the sutra, from similar references in the *Critical Essay*, this is probably a passage in the *Nirvāṇa Sutra* in which the Buddha entrusts the dharma to kings, ministers, and the four-fold assembly (T.12.375.621a10–11). Zanning, in his *Song gaoseng zhuan* biography of Zongmi, defends Zongmi (and by extension himself) against charges of improper involvement with the court with a similar explanation:

his own disinterestedness, a refrain that appears throughout all the letters: "I am worried about the dharma, not worried about myself. I am worried for the dharma, not worried about fame."[68] He also explains that "people of Wu," disciples of his who "feared that this work and this teacher would disappear into obscurity together" are responsible for having woodblocks carved for the *Essays to Aid the Teaching*, woodblocks from which the copies he is submitting have been printed.[69]

Here let us note that by 1058, Qisong had already composed the *Record*, the *Chart*, and at least the first part of the *Critical Essay*. Why did he not ask Cui and the unidentified monk to present these works as well? Perhaps, unsatisfied with what he had written or stung by criticism, he chose to hold back the *True Lineage* texts so that he could revise them. Perhaps, worried that the anti-Buddhist rhetoric of certain ancient-style writers would gain a hearing at the imperial court and result in a withdrawal of support or even of persecution, he chose to concentrate on that threat, rather than the Tiantai attack on Chan lineage. Perhaps he hoped to use the *Essays to Aid the Teaching* as the thin end of the wedge to gain entry to the canon.

> There are some people who blame Zongmi, saying it was improper for him either to receive nobles and officials or to visit the emperor. I [Zanning] would answer this charge with these words: "[The Buddha] entrusted the Dharma to kings and ministers. If one has not connection with kings and ministers, how can the religion spread and flourish? Are the Buddha's words about the helpful power of sovereigns (Cakravartin) and ministers incorrect? The sentiment of men in the present age is critical to anyone who is closely associated with the court. This is because the critics do not fully understand the purpose of those who associate with kings and ministers. Should their association be merely for personal fame or profit, I would be grateful to those critics. However, should the association be only for the sake of religion, one should strive after that great achievement rather than escape insignificant criticism. His critics objected to his actions and simply were jealous of him, but their criticism is meaningless if we understand the intention of the monk. (Trans. Jan Yün-hua, "Tsung-mi: His Analysis of Ch'an Buddhism," 19, with minor corrections and a switch to pinyin.)

Although Qisong certainly knew Zanning's works, the lack of shared language leads me to think that Qisong was not drawing on Zanning, simply responding with the same reasoning to similar situations.

Consider, too, that Zhiyi, on his deathbed, dictated a letter to the Sui heir apparent, with whom he had close relations, in order to "entrust the dharma" to him. See Weinstein, "Imperial Patronage in the Formation of T'ang Buddhism," 281–2, and Leon Hurvitz, "Chih-i (538–597)," 166–9.

[68] *Collected Works*, 695b29–c1.

[69] *Collected Works*, 694b27, 696a2021.

When the first set of letters produced no response (or perhaps the advice to appeal to others), Qisong aimed at more highly-placed officials and made his ambition explicit. He entrusted copies of the *Essays to Aid the Teaching* plus his essay "Huangji lun" (Discussion of the Rules Established by the Emperor) to an assistant magistrate in Hangzhou, Guan Jingren 關景仁 (*jinshi*, 1059), who was making a trip to Kaifeng. Guan delivered the texts, along with letters, to the powerful Grand Councilors Han Qi 韓琦 (1008–75) and Fu Bi 富弼 (1004–1083) at some point between mid-1059 and October 6, 1061.[70]

In the letter Guan presented to Han, Qisong writes:

> While in the mountains, I wrote a book called *Essays to Aid the Teaching*...In the beginning, I wanted to present it to the Son of Heaven. But being lowly and distant, [I] could not ascend to reach [him]...Now it has already been a year, and its success or failure has [still] not been decided. It is as if my worrying mind is treading on water and fire. [I] urgently desire help. Therefore, without avoiding the punishment for overstepping, [I] dare to present the *Essays to Aid the Teaching* in a printed edition in three parts.[71]

Qisong's letters to Han and Fu present the same text with the same appeal as had the earlier letters. In them, however, Qisong pointedly displays his classical education. Addressing Han, he begins with a discussion of sages and quotes the *Shujing* 書經 and Confucius; writing Fu, he alludes to an historical precedent for a lowly man's desire to serve the ruler and quotes from Sima Qian 司馬遷 and Laozi. These handsomely written letters, however, did not produce the desired result, and as Qisong reports, he decided to take more drastic action: "[I] bundled up [my] books and hastened to the capital."[72]

The Trip to Kaifeng

Taking on the long-established role of a petitioner who travels to the capital to seek recognition and justice from the throne, Qisong no sooner arrived in Kaifeng than he sent a "ten thousand word" memorial letter to the emperor. In this memorial, Qisong reports that:

---

[70] Both men had been prominent allies of the reformist Fan Zhongyan 范仲淹 (989–1052) and suffered demotion in the wake of the 1043–44 Qingli reforms.

[71] *Collected Works*, 692b17–25.

[72] *Collected Works*, 687a17.

> Recently, with the rise of ancient-style writing, *ru* scholars have written to reject the Buddha. This has caused the gradual weakening of the path of the Buddha and increasing confusion among the people under heaven who practice goodness. Therefore, this is related to the civilizing force of your majesty. If [your majesty] does not energetically rescue [them], this path and moral transformation will be lost.[73]

Thus indicting Han Yu without naming him, Qisong turns Han's criticism of Buddhism—that it corrupts and weakens Chinese civilization—on its head, blaming Han Yu for setting off a decline in Buddhism which will weaken the civilizing force of the emperor.[74]

Qisong acknowledges the emperor as the one person with the power to rescue the Buddhist path—and thereby strengthen his own power to improve society.[75] As he puts it, the emperor is the one to "correct the paths of the two sages, Confucius and the Buddha, cutting off the doubts of the world."[76] He goes on to argue forcefully for the compatibility of the *wangdao* 王道, or "kingly way" and the Buddhist path, since each is a "middle path." Along the way, he makes reference to every early Chinese classic but the *Zhuangzi*. He prefaces a detailed comparison of the two "middle paths" with a statement that reveals how his arguments, however thoroughly he bolsters them with allusions and evidence, are governed by his own profound allegiances:

> As for writers today, all of them say that one must oppose the [teachings of] the Buddha, resulting in the abandonment of Buddhism by the world. Instead they respect the path of the single king and admire the rulers of

---

[73] *Collected Works*, 687a11–14. Following a suggestion by Chen Jinhua, I regard the existing Taishō text, which has *gujin* 古今, as a scribal reversal of characters and have adjusted the text accordingly.

[74] Huang Chi-chiang also notes that Qisong does not name Han Yu ("Experiment in Syncretism," 164–5).

[75] Huang Chi-chiang describes one aspect of this attitude of the early Song emperors toward Buddhism as the struggle to define themselves as privileged in relation to the Buddha. In particular, he sees early Song emperors regarding themselves as patriarchs of the *sangha* ("Imperial Rulership," 165). Although there are precedents for Chinese rulers considering themselves Buddhas and bodhisattvas, I believe Huang is mistaken when it comes to the early Song emperors. When Qisong appeals to Renzong as the authority to whom the dharma had been entrusted by the Buddha, he draws on a venerable Buddhist conception of the ruler as parallel to the Buddha, with his own responsibilities and role, including the duty to protect the dharma, but ultimately limited to the realm of the mundane. Emperors cannot, therefore, have a place within the lineage itself. They are, however, the most important patrons, and Qisong perhaps extends a traditional Indian Buddhist understanding of the function of the ruler to include a classical Chinese view of his role as a moral exemplar.

[76] *Collected Works*, 609a8–9.

> the three dynasties [Xia, Shang, Zhou]. How can they know that the path of the Buddha and the kingly way are compatible?[77]

In other words, these writers fail to see the fundamental compatibility of Buddhism and the Chinese imperial tradition.

Qisong goes on to refute Han's arguments again without naming him. Han had described emperors weakening and harming themselves and their rule through the support of Buddhism. Qisong instead describes two types of emperors, those who neglected Buddhism and suffered for it and those whose support of it allowed them to live (and reign) long. When Qisong wrote this memorial letter in the fall of 1061, Renzong, born in 1010, had been on the throne since 1023 and had suffered life-threatening illness as recently as 1056. Qisong's appeal may have been a calculatedly personal one.

A striking feature of Qisong's writing, evident in many of his letters and memorial letters, is his presentation of himself as personally disinterested—"for the dharma, not for fame"—and yet passionately concerned with the fate of the dharma. The following conclusion to a plea for Renzong to reverse a policy on ordination age serves as an example: "I also worry that this dharma more and more will not obtain suitable people, and the way of the sages will gradually be extinguished. Because of this, for a long time, [my] sleep has not been peaceful, nor [my] food tasty."[78]

When Qisong's ten thousand words of distress, appeal, and argument failed to provoke an official response, he changed tack. He wrote Han Qi again and, with a combination of eagerness and impatience, reminded the Grand Councilor that, having heard good things about him, he had already submitted *Essays to Aid the Teaching* to him through Guan Jingren. He then explains that he "arrived in the capital over a month ago" and wishes to meet Han in person.

Qisong also explains that he has a further contribution to make; without giving a title, he describes the *True Lineage* texts: "This work mends lacunae in the teaching. [It] corrects both the patriarchs and the lineage of my Buddhist clan. [I] hope that the son of Heaven will

---

[77] *Collected Works*, 687a19–20.
[78] *Collected Works*, 690c2–4.

include it in the canon so as put a stop to the doubts and disputes among those who study Buddhism."[79]

Why did Qisong introduce the *True Lineage* texts at this juncture? How are they connected to the decision to come to Kaifeng? Around the time of this second letter to Han Qi, Qisong also wrote to Zeng Gongliang again, and this letter provides a clear answer. As with Han, Qisong reminds Zeng that he had submitted the *Essays to Aid the Teaching* to him with the help of Cui but admits that he does not know if Zeng has read it. He explains his journey to Kaifeng: "It is because [I] wish to present a Chan work and the *Chart of Patriarchs* to the Son of Heaven…The basis for my coming is that the patriarchs and lineage of the teaching of our Buddhist clan is indistinct, not very clear."[80]

In other words, Qisong claims that he came to Kaifeng because he wanted to present the *True Lineage* texts to the court. If this is so, why did he not present them when he first arrived, but instead write a round of letters in support of the *Essays to Aid the Teaching*? Andō, noticing as I have the shift in emphasis between Qisong's first and second letters to Han Qi, proposes that Qisong's efforts to have the *Essays to Aid the Teaching* accepted into the canon were perhaps a screen for his very real anxiety about the acceptance of the *True Lineage* texts.[81] His reading tends toward the psychological, whereas this may not have been a deliberate strategy. Qisong may have imagined that his *ru* writings would help to win approval for the Chan works, and when that did not happen, he brought out the *True Lineage* works and pleaded their case directly.

Triumph

Qisong ultimately succeeded in having the *Essays to Aid the Teaching* and the *True Lineage* works presented to Renzong, thanks to a patron who does not appear in the correspondence: Wang Su 王素 (1007–1073), the prefect of Kaifeng and another member of the reformist group.

---

[79] *Collected Works*, 692c16–18., with the Taishō punctuation corrected to place a period before 正.

[80] Collected Works, 696c6–7, 12–13, understanding 固 as 故. I have omitted an unintentionally amusing passage in which Qisong recounts how Zeng's subordinates repeatedly refused to allow him into Zeng's presence.

[81] "Butsunichi Meikyō Kaisū shikō," 124.

Wang Su submitted Qisong's works and a second memorial letter on January 19, 1062. A straightforward note of Wang's own composition accompanied them, and in it, he presents Qisong as examining the sūtras and śāstras of the canon for the origins of Chan patriarchs and lineage "in order to correct errors in the biographies."[82] He mentions the *Essays to Aid the Teaching* only in passing as an older work by Qisong also being submitted.

Qisong's second memorial letter to Renzong differs significantly from the first, perhaps because the first was ineffective. Rather than quote the classics and emphasize the compatibility of Confucian and Buddhist teachings, Qisong focuses even more on the role of the ruler in protecting the dharma. He claims that it was because of this that he felt obliged to leave the "mountain," i.e., his monastery, and seek the emperor's help in resolving the uncertainty surrounding Chan lineage. He recognizes explicitly the power of the ruler to affect the "increase and decrease, the expansion and contraction" of the Buddhist teaching.[83] He writes:

> When Śākyamuni transmitted his teachings, he had to rely on meditation as its lineage and the Buddha(s) as its patriarchs. The patriarch is the great model of the teaching. The lineage is the great succession of the teaching. If the great succession is not clear, then those who study [the teachings of] the Buddha everywhere will not agree on their goal. If the great model is not corrected, then [they] will not be able to verify their awakening.[84]

Qisong here appeals to Renzong on two levels. The first, remarked upon by Foulk, is the parallel implied by Qisong's use of the terms *datong* 大統, or 'great succession,' and *dafan* 大範, or 'great model,' between imperial succession, upon which national stability and harmony depend, and Chan lineage, upon which the transmission of the dharma relies. Foulk argues that Qisong is suggesting that state recognition and support for Chan lineage would aid the state both in controlling

---

82 *Record*, 715c16.

83 *Record*, 715a10–11. This phrase, recalling as it does, a traditional Chinese notion of cycles of moral and social flourishing and decline rather than a traditional Buddhist idea of prolonged decline between Buddhas hints at a hybrid theory of history, which I address later.

84 *Record*, 75a15–18.

Buddhism and being bolstered by the Buddhist community.[85] Much earlier in his reign, Renzong had supported Chan and its genealogical project by accepting and prefacing the *Tiansheng guangdeng lu*.[86] I would add that the issue of succession was of particular concern to Renzong and his court when Qisong wrote this memorial. The emperor's health had not been good, and since none of his sons had survived into adulthood, succession had long been a concern. In the fall of 1061, he received a number of memorials urging him to designate an heir from among his kinsmen, and he made a choice not long after he made a decision about Qisong's works.[87] Qisong's insistence on the need for clarity in the line of spiritual descent in the Chan school may very well have struck a nerve at court.

Wang Su submitted Qisong's works and memorial letter in early 1062, and as Qisong awaited a response, he continued to seek support among court officials. He reached beyond the circle of his acquaintance from Hangzhou and beyond the circle of those known for involvement with the Buddhist community when he wrote to Ouyang Xiu. To Ouyang, the leading proponent of Han Yu's revival of ancient-style writing and his criticisms of Buddhism, Qisong sent the *Essays to Aid the Teaching* and some travel writing. In his letter to Ouyang, he does not mention the *True Lineage* works, although Ouyang might

[85] "Ch'an Myths," 73.

Interestingly, thanks to its foreign origin and vision of a separate monastic realm, Buddhist claims, whether Chan or Tiantai, of a transmission of authority from the Buddha could serve as a parallel to imperial authority and even support it. Confucian notions of *daotong*, which Wilson translates as "genealogy of the Way" and Bol as "line of continuity within the tao," on the other hand, always warred with imperial authority.

Jan Yün-hua expresses his surprise that later Tiantai historians were able to write in the form of a dynastic history without incurring imperial wrath ("Buddhist Historiography," 371, esp. n. 46). It seems clear that Chan historians, without taking this step, paved the way for it.

[86] On the significance and content of this preface, see Welter, *Monks, Rulers, and Literati*, 186–7.

[87] In mid-1062, Renzong designated as his heir a cousin who reigned briefly as Yingzong 英宗 (r. 1063–1067).

Xiao-bin Ji discusses this episode as well as the succession troubles preceding and following it in order to argue that Sima Guang's role in securing the succession contributed to a special relationship with the imperial family (*Politics and Conservatism in Northern Song China: The Career and Thought of Sima Guang (A.D. 1019–1086)*, chap. 4). Chaffee also discusses the episode (*Branches of Heaven*, 64–6).

A question arising from Yingzong's succession, the proper ritual treatment for Yingzong's father, became a major controversy during his reign. See Carney Fisher, "The Ritual Dispute of Song Ying-tsung."

have encountered them at court. And, as Huang Chi-chiang has noted, although Qisong had already written a lengthy rebuttal of Han Yu's views, entitled "Fei Han" [Against Han], he did not present this work in Kaifeng, much less bring it to Ouyang's attention.[88] In other words, although Qisong was clearly rejecting Han's ideas about Buddhism, he let his arguments emerge in context, rather than as a direct attack.

From Qisong's third missive to Han Qi, we learn that the monk finally had some success. Han met with him, treated him warmly, praised his writing to other officials, and supported him at court.[89] Qisong expresses his feeling of good fortune at this turn of events and then presses for resolution, even threatening to return to his mountain retreat. Whether a ploy or sincere, his plea is revealing.

> [I] wish to complete this matter and return. Now the book has been presented, and [I] have already waited more than sixty days for an edict and have not heard anything. In this, [I] am beginning to have doubts. Perhaps the book has errors and is not sufficient to be picked up by great worthies. Perhaps your excellency is too busy with matters of state and has no leisure to determine the truth of it.[90]

The conclusion of the letter includes the offer of lasting recognition for Han's role in resolving uncertainty about Chan lineage: "Later generations will say in admiration, 'In the great Song, the Son of Heaven's Minister of State, the Honorable Han, once made a decision and settled it.'"[91]

Renzong accepted Qisong's works into the imperial canon seventy-one days after their submission. In the course of the Northern Song, the Chan tradition was far more successful than others in winning entry to the imperial canon, but it was nevertheless remarkable for a living author who had not done his work at imperial command to receive the honor.

The chronology by itself suggests that Qisong's last memorial letter had the intended effect of securing Han's action on behalf of Qisong's writings, and Qisong's fourth and final letter to Han Qi, written after

---

[88] "Experiment in Syncretism," 164–5.

[89] Though we do not know the particulars of their conversation, we may speculate that Han Qi was especially sympathetic and curious about the genealogical aspect of Qisong's work, since he himself had continued his father's genealogical research. See Patricia Buckley Ebrey, *Women and the Family in Chinese History*, 114. My thanks to Ellen Neskar for alerting me to Han Qi's interest in genealogy.

[90] *Collected Works*, 693a26–29.

[91] *Collected Works*, 693b12–13.

Qisong left Kaifeng, confirms it with lavish praise for Han's assistance.[92] (Han did not receive the credit he was promised, however, for he appears only in letters included in Qisong's collected works and is not mentioned anywhere in the *True Lineage* works or the material accompanying them).

While the influence of Han is not to be underestimated, Qisong almost certainly owed his triumph to a concatenation of support from different quarters. His erudition had won the admiration of a number of highly-placed officials, including those he knew from Hangzhou, as well as the emperor's cousin Li Duanyuan. We must also consider what was absent. Whereas Renzong regularly spent time with Chan masters, including at least one Yunmen dharma heir, the members of the Tiantai school most willing and able to dispute Qisong's account of Chan lineage were not present in Kaifeng. Indeed, as the Japanese monk Jōjin would soon write in his journal, "there is no Tiantai in the north."[93]

Reasons for Success

The above narration of Qisong's success in Kaifeng illustrates that the previous assumption that Qisong's "syncretic" writings paved the way for the *True Lineage* texts is unfounded. Scholars have long thought that Qisong's Confucian tendencies won him favor in the eyes of the literati and the emperor, but it appears that the deciding factors were instead an appeal to the emperor as having a powerful influential role in the fate of the dharma and a focus on the parallel between Chan lineage and imperial lineage as the successions of authority in separate but parallel realms. It also seems that officials and the emperor may have responded to the sectarian conflict that gave rise to the *True Lineage* texts as if it were a family dispute. Resolving that dispute required them both to honor ancestors and to clarify the proper source of authority within a family.

Scholars have also assumed previously that the influence and popularity of Qisong's Yunmen 'dharma cousin' Huailian, who enjoyed a close relationship to Renzong, played a role in the quick acceptance of

[92] *Collected Works*, 693b–c. Qisong may have written other letters to thank those who helped him, but this is the only one that survives.

[93] Takao, *Sōdai Bukkyōshi no kenkyū* 75.

Qisong's writings. The letters examined above shed no light on the issue because Qisong nowhere mentions Huailian in his letters. Huailian's role must remain in the realm of speculation. That said, it is entirely possible and even probable that Huailian served as a source of helpful personal information about Renzong and of valuable advice about whom to write and which arguments might be effective with which officials.

The issue of Huailian's role raises another question: given that Qisong's writings did not privilege the Yunmen line in particular, did other Chan dharma heirs offer support as well? The circumstances of the printing of the *True Lineage* texts, recounted below, suggest strongly that they did.

Printing and Continuing Controversy

Imperial acceptance of Qisong's works did not stifle criticism of them, and it is perhaps a sign that some form of monastic autonomy prevailed in such cases, for it was not a matter of lèse majesté to cast doubt on a set of texts the emperor had just accepted. Chen Shunyu reports that, after the acceptance, "lecturers of the Buddha despised his words of separate transmission and ridiculed his lineage as nonexistent."[94] Huihong writes that "those who study the vinaya" became bitterly envious and concocted theories to oppose him. In response, Huihong continues, Qisong wrote even more, drawing on material from antiquity to the present to help make the proof extremely clear.[95]

Are Chen and Huihong describing the same opponents? If nothing else, the disparate descriptions of them reminds us that sectarian affiliation was still in formation and far from universal among elite monks. In any case, if Huihong is referring to scholars who specialized in the study of vinaya texts, it is easy to imagine their indignation at both at Qisong's criticism of Zanning and at his use of Sengyou's listing of transmitters of the vinaya as a source for Chan lineage.[96]

---

[94] *Collected Works*, 648b29–c1.

[95] *Chanlin sengbao zhuan*, ZZ 2b.10.3, 273d9–14.

[96] On Zanning's involvement with vinaya studies as well as the historical situation he faced while evaluating and interpreting Chan for the early Song court, see Albert Welter, "Zanning and Chan: The Changing Nature of Buddhism in Early Song China."

Renzong's approval of Qisong's writings did not mean that they were immediately printed and put into circulation. Rather, they were sent to the Chuanfa yuan (Institute for the Transmission of the Dharma), an institution founded by Taizong 太宗 (r. 977–997) to house those translating Buddhist texts from Sanskrit and to prepare texts for inclusion in the imperial canon (and where, in late 1072, Jōjin was shown the *Essays to Aid the Teaching*).[97] Due to the financial straits in which the government found itself, due to the cost of keeping peace at the northwestern borders by sending payments to the Xixia 西夏, or Tangut, state, the expense of carving the printing blocks was delayed.[98] In the end, private funds made the printing of Qisong's work possible in 1064 at a monastery in Suzhou, a move Yanagida Seizan regards as typical of a shift from state to private responsibility in Buddhist printing.[99] Shoujian守堅, the abbot at this monastery, the Wanshou chanyuan, and an heir in the fading Fayan line of Chan lineage, also had the *Chart* carved in stone.[100] According to Shiina Kōyū, the stele did not

---

[97] Huang Chi-chiang, *Bei Song Fojiao shi lungao*, 159. The monk who showed them to him explained, "In our country, there was a monk who transmitted the dharma. He was called the Great Master Mingjiao, Qisong, upon whom a purple robe had been bestowed. He penetrated the inner and outer teachings. His practice of the precepts was pure, his nature upright. He wrote this work of three parts, and most of it defends and upholds the three jewels" (*San Tendai godai sanki*, j. 4). Unfortunately, the catalog of works Jōjin had copied and sent back to Japan does not survive so we do not know if Qisong's Confucian work interested him enough to be included. Nor do we know if Jōjin encountered the *True Lineage* works, which, given his interest in Chan history, recently explored by Robert Borgen in "Court Culture, Conventional Wisdom, and the Sources of Japanese Zen," one presumes he would have read had he the chance.

[98] According to the *Song huiyao jigao* 宋會要輯稿, v. 8, 7893a), the printing press attached to the institute was shut down completely in 1071. See Jan Yün-hua, "Ch'uan-fa Yuan," 79. Tansen Sen, however, has found evidence suggesting that it was quickly back up and working (*Buddhism, Diplomacy, and Trade*, 117).

[99] Yanagida Seizan, "Dai zōkyō to zenroku no nyūzo," 533. According to a note attached to the *Record*, dated April 30, 1064, in the third year after Qisong's return to Wu, a man of Wujun 吳郡 (modern Suzhou) delighted in the story of Qisong's triumph and donated funds for plates to be engraved at Wanshou chanyuan in his hometown (*Record*, 716a). Material attached to a copy of the *Chart* credits the abbot, Shoujian, with soliciting alms to erect a stone at the cloister (T. Zuzō 10, 25). Two pieces of correspondence with the abbot of Wanshou, previously unremarked upon by scholars, have been preserved and add a few more details to the circumstances (*Collected Works*, 702b).

[100] According to the *Xu chuandeng lu*, Shoujian was the dharma heir of Zhangjiang Zhaoyuan 彰（漳）江昭遠, who is himself listed as the heir of two third-generation descendents of Fayan Wenyi 法眼文益, Luohan Xinglin 羅漢行林 and Yunju Daoqi 雲居道齊 (T51.2077.553c8–11, 528c, 529b). Shoujian may have been particularly interested in Qisong's *Record* because it includes both of his master's masters.

survive long. A rubbing made its way to Japan, however, and in 1154 was copied onto a scroll by a monk named Jōen 定円.[101]

During the delay in printing, Qisong added annotations to the *True Lineage* texts, particularly the *Critical Essay*.[102] Some of the annotations seem to be clarifications inspired by his own re-reading of the texts, and others are almost certainly responses to continuing criticism. Later Tiantai sources, when describing the struggle between Qisong and Zifang, choose not to mention Qisong's trip to the capital or his success there.[103] They do report that three years after Zifang wrote "On Patriarchs," Qisong perceived certain difficulties with the *Meditation Sutra*—which he blamed on a copyist's errors—and revised his account of Chan history with a reliance on the name of Sengyou and his *Notes on the Translation of the Tripiṭaka* and the reputation of the vinaya tradition for his self-serving theory. This description seems to correspond to an interlinear note in the *Critical Essay* concerning Bodhidharma's name.[104]

During this period, the same Tiantai sources inform us (and are seconded by Huihong), Qisong composed a rejoinder to critics, entitled "Jie wu" 解誣 [Resolving Slander].[105] This work is now lost except for a portion preserved by Zhipan.[106] Zifang responded with the last known volley in this controversy, "Zhi e" 止訛 [Putting an End to Lies]. In the passage of the "Zhi e" quoted by Zhipan, Zifang tells us that he met his foe in person and "reproached him, but [Qi]song was shameless."[107]

---

[101] "Hoku-Sō chokuhan daizōkyō to nyūzō zenseki" 北宋大蔵経と入蔵禅籍. This scroll is reproduced in T.95.3201.

[102] The annotations are not dated, but Qisong remarks that he "does not dare alter" the text approved by Renzong.

[103] Elsewhere Zhipan does describe Qisong's success in the capital, casting him as a defender of the faith (*Fozu tongji*, T.49.2035.413a27–b10, 455a15–17).

[104] *Critical Essay*, 776a.

[105] It may be that the later revision of the *Record* and the *Critical Essay* as well as the composing of "Resolving Slander" were lost along with many other works composed toward the end of Qisong's life.

[106] The existence of this work, mentioned only once in Qisong's extant writings (an interlineal note in the *Critical Essay*, 776a21), has gone unremarked by scholars other than Takao, who noticed Zongjian's mention of it. As noted below, Huihong may also have described its composition.

[107] *Fozu tongji*, T.49.2035.242a15. While Zongjian does not quote or summarize "Putting an End to Lies," his language echoes it strongly enough to suggest that he had a copy available to him while he wrote about Zifang.

I will address the details of Zifang's criticism of Qisong in the next two chapters. Here let us simply note the fate of Zifang's opposition. Despite the detailed and sound historical arguments Zifang makes, he was unable to stop Qisong. The Tiantai school, likely distracted by internal controversy, could not muster an effective counter-campaign. As for Zifang's writings, Zongjian reports that at some point in the Jiayou and Zhiping eras [1056–1068], Shen Qi, an official in the Criminal Administration Bureau, composed a preface and an afterword, but that in Zongjian's day, i.e., the early thirteenth century, it is not a work that has been printed and put into circulation.[108]

Conclusion

A close examination of the circumstances surrounding Qisong's efforts to earn a place for his works in the imperial canon undermines previous assumptions about the relative importance of different works in the process and clarifies Qisong's brand of pro-Chan sectarianism as well as his view of Buddhist-Confucian compatibility. It also illustrates the reasons and motives for elite Buddhists to seek imperial control to settle intra-Buddhist controversies.

As we will see in the next chapter, much of Jan Yün-hua's ill opinion of Qisong as an historian appears to be based on the perception that in order to secure imperial approval for his writings, he was willing to compromise monastic independence as well as historical standards.[109] The evidence lies in the other direction. First of all, Qisong was willing to counter publicly both widespread anti-Buddhist sentiment and government policies adopted under the influence of that antagonism.[110] Secondly, Qisong's attitude toward the emperor, which might appear overly submissive, is not out of line with that taken by other Song Buddhists, most notably Zanning. (Indeed, Chen Yuan and Jan also criticize Zanning).[111] Continuing awareness of both the destructive and constructive power of rulers, exemplified by the

[108] *Shimen zhengtong*, XZJ 130.445b11–12. Shen is no relation to Shen Gou or Shen Liao, but he is from Mingzhou 明州, a Tiantai stronghold in Zhejiang.

[109] See Jan, *Sung Biographies*, 191–2.

[110] See, for example, Chün-fang Yü, *The renewal of Buddhism in China: Chu-hung and the Late Ming Synthesis*, 162–3, and Schlütter, *How Zen Became Zen*, 33.

[111] Chen, *Zhongguo Fojiao shiji gailun*, 38–40, and Jan, "Buddhist Historiography in Sung China," 364.

Huichang repression of Buddhism and the Five Dynasties-period Wu kingdom protection of it, respectively, almost certainly played a part. As Schlütter demonstrates, few, if any, monastic leaders chose independence over the prospect of increased security through state recognition in the form of name plaques and public monastery designation.[112] Thirdly, as noted above, even if Qisong did it opportunistically, in calling on Renzong to act as a protector of the dharma, Qisong drew on a long tradition of state involvement with Buddhism. We should not be surprised to see Buddhists using the state to their advantage, just as the state attempted to use Buddhism to further its own ends. A related and perhaps more interesting question is whether the concept of lineage itself ties Chan particularly closely to the state, as it seems to have done on numerous occasions.

The story of the composition and acceptance of the *True Lineage* texts also reminds us that allegiances and affiliations are not monolithic or exclusive. Qisong proclaims his admiration of Confucius and past emperors while seeking imperial approval of a Chan genealogy. Tiantai monks on both sides of the home-mountain/off-mountain conflict opposed what they saw as the outrageous claims of Chan historians, and members of different lines of Chan lineage cooperated in spreading Qisong's works. State officials known for advocating policies restricting Buddhist activities were called upon to introduce to the emperor the writings of a Buddhist monk.

What can we learn about sectarianism in the mid-Northern Song from the above account of Qisong's composition of and campaign for the *True Lineage* texts? One interesting point is that home-mountain/off-mountain controversy—and a general search for orthodoxy in Tiantai—heightened the level of conflict between Chan and Tiantai. It is also evident that defining clearly on what level and with what consequences a conflict occurred is very important. It is all too easy to conflate a doctrinal dispute with an institutional break or, in the case of Qisong, a repudiation of Tiantai criticism of Chan lineage with general antagonism toward Tiantai. In fact, Qisong seems to have had a fair amount of good will for the members of that school.

The evidence for this good will may be found in the eulogy Qisong wrote for the Tiantai leader Zunshi. This piece, which has long served

---

[112] Schlütter, "Vinaya Monasteries, Public Abbacies, and State Control of Buddhism under the Song (960–1279)," 139.

as the primary resource on Zunshi's life, reflects both Qisong's admiration for a master he never met and his amicable relationship with that master's heirs, particularly Zushao 祖韶 (n.d.) and Biancai Yuanjing 辯才元淨 (1011–1091), who were prominent in Hangzhou.[113] Qisong did not compose the eulogy from scratch, instead receiving a draft prepared by Zushao and then polishing it. No matter the extent of his actual work on the document, it is significant that Qisong was asked to compose it and that he agreed. It demonstrates that his reputation as both a writer and a Buddhist eclipsed any ill will on the part of Zunshi's dharma heirs.[114] A number of scholars have noted that literati often agreed to write pieces about topics they generally disdained, out of official duty or obligation, but Qisong, thanks to literary skill admired by monastic and official elites alike, could put his sectarian identity aside to perform a role appropriate to a defender of the faith, a generic Buddhist, as it were.[115] And he did respect monks of other schools, without acknowledging their lineage as superior. (One wonders, however, whether he would have been asked to write or have been willing to write such a piece for Zhili; Zunshi was an easier case, perhaps, since he was not involved directly in anti-Chan polemics).

For all his efforts to establish Chan lineage, Qisong seems not to have been a contender in the competition for material patronage. Indeed, he seems more concerned with the ideological and less with the practical. As far as we know, his defense of Chan lineage was not tied to a specific campaign for public monastery status or to any other concrete piece of patronage beyond the printing and distribution of his works. He wanted imperial approval for his version of Chan lineage and all related claims for the centrality of Chan to Buddhism. His success in this no doubt affected the cases of others in his school seeking such support, but he himself did not, to our knowledge, request or receive it.

As noted earlier, Qisong's presentation of Chan lineage reveals a different model of sectarianism than that of earlier defenders and cre-

---

113 See Stevenson on the place Qisong's eulogy holds in the study of Zunshi ("Protocols of Power," 396, n. 8).

114 An example of literary affinity overriding sectarian concerns is Qisong's prefacing a poetry collection by Chan master Baoyue at the behest of Huayan master Jinshui Qingyuan (1011–1088), dated 1061 in Kaifeng. See Huang, "Experiment in Syncretism," 169–70.

115 Halperin offers a general discussion of how and why literati came to write inscriptions for monasteries (*Out of the Cloister*, 14–20).

ators of Chan lineage. While he may have enjoyed the honors he received, his motive was not to win himself a prestigious position; as noted in the previous chapter, when offered the abbot's seat at a monastery in the capital, Qisong declined and pleaded to be allowed to return to Hangzhou, where he held no office.[116] Unlike Shenhui and Zongmi, he did not write a history of dharma transmission in order to secure the place of his own master or his own branch of Chan lineage. Nor did he offer, as did Zongmi, a critique of the teachings of other branches. Qisong's work on lineage thus extends the transition from lineage claims as specific claims to lineage as more general and less competitive. Furthermore, though Qisong benefited from his own membership in the powerful Yunmen lineage, he spent his time defending (and constructing) larger entities like Chan and Buddhism and even "the truth of the sages," a notion we will explore in the next two chapters.

In the end, whatever his motives and strategies, Qisong's historical work was well received. In a seventeenth-century lineage dispute recently studied by Jiang Wu, for example, both sides looked to Qisong for support. A Linji monk, Feiyin Tongrong, wrote a work in which he moved certain Caodong figures into the 'lineage unknown' category.[117] When criticized for deviating from the imperially-sanctioned *Jingde Record of the Transmission*, he retorted that he was following the example of Qisong in correcting mistakes in previous histories.[118] Nor did he hesitate to criticize the format of Qisong's own history.[119] Yu Dacheng, a lay supporter of the Caodong monks, on the other hand, was outraged that Feiyin would contradict Qisong's lineage history, which he considered the most authoritative from the Song.[120]

---

[116] As noted in the last chapter, only later did he serve as abbot, at a fairly small monastery where his strictness reportedly drove some monks away.

[117] *Enlightenment in Dispute*, 187.

[118] *Enlightenment in Dispute*, 215–6.

[119] *Enlightenment in Dispute*, 216–7.

[120] *Enlightenment in Dispute*, 203–4.

PART THREE

QISONG ON LINEAGE AND HISTORY

CHAPTER FIVE

QISONG AS HISTORIAN: A READING OF THE FIRST FASCICLE OF THE *CRITICAL ESSAY ON THE TRUE LINEAGE OF THE TRANSMISSION OF THE DHARMA*

Introduction

Tiantai critics were the first to question Qisong's integrity as an historian, but some modern scholars have followed suit. Chen Yuan, for example, delivers this biting condemnation of Qisong:

> [Qi]song, then, was skilled at writing but careless in the examination of history; frequently using emotion as a screen, he does not excise from false historical material that which he likes, and he jeers recklessly at earlier generations. The notice to the Siku edition of the *Tanjin* [*wen*] *ji* [Qisong's collected works] says that he relied on anger to seek victory, and Dongpo [Su Shi] said that he was always irate and never seen to smile. If this was his inborn character, it is not to be wondered at.[1]

Jan Yün-hua writes that Qisong:

> disregarded all historiographical principles, denied all factual mistakes and contradictions as simply confusions "created" by past historians or as errors arising out of linguistic inadequacy, and maintained on these grounds that they should be disregarded. He does no more than put an emotional insistence on the Ch'an sectarian claim for the lineage of patriarchs without any historical justification.[2]

While these judgments are not unwarranted, they do justice neither to the creativity nor to the historical sophistication Qisong displays in his defense and reformulation of Chan lineage in the *Critical Essay*. Creativity, of course, is not a quality generally admired in the writing of history, except as it applies to innovative historiographical techniques (and sometimes even then), so we ought not be surprised that

---

[1] *Zhongguo Fojiao shiji gailun*, 120.

[2] "Ch'i-sung" in *Sung Biographies*, 191. He also comments, "In spite of his rather liberal and compromising attitude toward the Neo-Confucian elite, and, to some extent even some individual Taoist priest[s], Ch'i-sung's attitude toward Buddhist history was quite sectarian" (190).

many historians have judged Qisong as they have. It is a surprise, however, that Qisong is not given more credit for historical sophistication. Perhaps, given their shared emphasis on emotion in Qisong's work, even though neither Chen nor Jan says it explicitly, their objection to Qisong may not be that he is not capable of producing 'good' history but that because his temperament or sectarian loyalties led him astray, he chose not to. Neither Chen nor Jan spells out the difficult truth: Qisong demonstrates considerable sophistication in his use of documents, is willing to entertain doubts about the reliability of a text or parts of a text, and uses texts to confirm or contradict other texts, but he applies this skill only to the arguments of his opponents. When actively making his own argument, he argues, with feeling, from his own conviction about the nature of Chan transmission and the Chan patriarchs.

Hu Shi attributed Qisong's misjudging of material, at least in the case of Bodhidharma, not to an active desire to deceive, but to his simply being a man of his times, accustomed to Chan writings of the late Tang and Five Dynasties and not to earlier texts.[3] It is precisely this question of 'innocence' that complicates any evaluation of Qisong. It is impossible to determine how often he knowingly bent material to his purposes or if he was, as Hu suggests, simply incapable of understanding it otherwise.

In the following close reading of the first fascicle of the *Critical Essay*, rather than castigating or excusing Qisong, let us detail the manner in which he creatively elaborates on his tradition even as he defends it from critics of its authenticity. Instead of regarding him merely as failing to meet to modern historical standards, let us understand him as a participant in his tradition. Foulk, in his treatment of Qisong in an article on varying interpretations of the 'separate transmission' of Chan, has already begun this re-evaluation of Qisong. In Qisong's critique of an assertion Li Zunxu makes in the *Tiansheng Extensive Record*, Foulk finds that Qisong uses historical argument when possible but places some elements of Chan history off-limits, either because the historical record is weak or because dharma transmission is by its very nature not fully accessible to those not a party to it.[4] In what follows, I will build on Foulk's observations by focusing particularly

[3] "Putidamo kao," 299.
[4] "Controversies Concerning the 'Separate Transmission,'" 258–60.

on Qisong's use of important pre-Chan and Chan texts. By directing attention to what Qisong emphasizes and overlooks in his sources, we may begin to understand the core beliefs that guide his readings and arguments. What, for example, is he placing off limits, and what does that tell us? What ideas of lineage he is reading back into these texts? In other words, let us see what we can learn if we focus on the expressions of his commitment to the Chan tradition as opposed to his commitment to 'truth.'

The *Critical Essay* and Its Concerns

The *Critical Essay*, two fascicles in length, contains three sections, written at different times, as well as layers of self-annotation in the form of interlinear notes. The first section, the first half of the first fascicle, was written in the early 1050s. Seven years later, when Qisong encountered new sources to bolster his original argument, he wrote the second section, which constitutes the second half of the first fascicle. (I will address the third section, which makes up the whole of the second fascicle and consists of a series of questions and answers, in the next chapter.) Somewhat later, most likely after the acceptance of the *True Lineage* works into the imperial canon in 1062, Qisong, not daring to alter what had been approved by the court, added interlineal notes to the *Critical Essay*.

Throughout the *Critical Essay*, the two issues that concern Qisong the most are the origin and validity of the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* and the history of knowledge of the dharma-transmission in China.[5] These two issues are closely related, given Qisong's overall project. He is acutely conscious of the dependence of Chan lineage on *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury*, even if he is unable or unwilling to perceive, as modern scholars have, that the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* was a primary source for the construction of Chan lineage. In order to fend off his Tiantai contemporaries, who pointed to the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* as proof that claims of uninterrupted Chan lineage were false, he needs both to discredit the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* and to find alternative sources for Chan lineage. Naturally, the identification of more ancient and

[5] T.50.2058 and Yanagida, *Songzang yizhen*, case 3, v. 10 and case 4, v. 1–2, respectively.

reliable sources of knowledge about the dharma-transmission is crucial to this project.

By his own later admission, in his first effort Qisong did not succeed in his mission. He kept trying, however, and his repeated attempts, preserved for us in the layers of the *Critical Essay*, reveal to us the inner workings and development of his historical arguments. Rather than presenting a single definitive analysis of a given issue, over time he experiments with different explanations, devising, developing, and rejecting them as he considers additional evidence. This experimentation results in a rather convoluted, albeit fascinating, text. In what follows, we will observe how Qisong's arguments unfold—and his level of anxiety fluctuates—as he makes use of different sources.

Because Qisong's argument at times centers on details of names and dates, we will of necessity encounter many of these. However, Qisong also begins to confront straightforwardly the larger issues of the meaning of dharma transmission and the motivation of Chan patriarchs and various historians, questions he develops further in the final section of the *Critical Essay*, to be discussed in the next chapter. As we will see, in this first section, these issues surface primarily in Qisong's treatment of the Tang monk Shenqing, whose comments on Chan history and lineage Qisong attacks vigorously as part of the overall project to present a credible version of Chan history.

Discrediting the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury*

The *Critical Essay* begins abruptly, as if the matter at hand is too pressing to allow for any general comments. Qisong announces that he is distressed by conflict over the legitimacy of Chan lineage and declares his determination to resolve the controversy. He explains that those rejecting Chan lineage claims as unfounded rely on the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* for proof while those supporting them draw on the *Baolin Record*, which, as the work of members of the Chan school, cannot be regarded as an unbiased source. He states his intention to investigate both these texts, giving the impression that he himself is impartial.

This initial posture of scholarly objectivity—and the lack of overt self-identification as a Chan monk and an heir to the dharma—drops away as soon as Qisong begins discussing the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury*. He starts with the conventional understanding of

the history of the text, that the account of twenty-four Indian monks to whom the dharma treasury was entrusted (*fu fazang* 付法藏) in turn, is said to have been translated by the Indian monk Kiṅkara 吉迦夜 during the Later Wei, in the mid-fifth century.[6]

Qisong finds the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* unsatisfactory from a number of angles. He accuses it of being unoriginal; that is, he argues that the more detailed parts have been "plucked from all sections of the tripiṭika" while the sections original to the text are muddled and incomplete.[7] Furthermore, the failure to provide basic information about the familial and monastic background of a number of its subjects renders it unworthy to be considered an historical account. He is particularly disturbed by the dearth of description of personal transmissions from master to disciple; how, he asks plaintively, can such a flawed account possibly earn the trust of later generations?[8]

Beyond the formal issues of provenance and historical standards, Qisong is troubled by the contents of the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury*, by the story it tells of the dharma transmission. He focuses on Siṃha, the monk identified by the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* as the last to be entrusted with the dharma treasury. In order to underline what he sees as an internal inconsistency, Qisong juxtaposes the end of the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* with its beginning, i.e., the heirless Siṃha's death at the hands of an unbelieving

[6] Modern scholars have identified the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* as a major source for the construction of Chan lineage as well as Tiantai lineage, and Qisong, like many before him in the Chan tradition, does not admit for a moment that this "entrusting of the dharma treasury" might be anything but dharma transmission as understood by the Chan school. He does so despite clear references in the text to figures in the biographies as men possessing some practical and intellectual mastery of the dharma and hence a responsibility to guard it, rather than fundamentally Buddha-like in and of themselves. Hence, he uses the term 'patriarch' (*zu*) to refer to the twenty-four monks, a designation that does not appear in the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury*, and disregards the term 'dharma treasury' in favor of the more ambiguous 'dharma.'

Kiṅkara is sometimes listed as the sole translator, but the name of the famous Śramaṇa Superintendent Tanyao frequently appears as well. As we will see, Tanyao assumes a central place in Qisong's theories of the provenance of the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury*, although he is not mentioned here.

[7] *Critical Essay*, 773c14–15. His recognition that the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* draws directly and heavily from other works—as opposed to simply sharing with them a common narrative of Indian Buddhist history—has been seconded and confirmed by Henri Maspero in his 1911 article on the text.

[8] *Critical Essay*, 773c25–6.

king and the words of the Buddha as he entrusted the dharma to Mahākāśyapa:

> [The *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury*] tells of the bhikṣu Siṃha, saying that the king of Kashmir had false views and because of this beheaded Siṃha with a sharp sword. From his head flowed no blood, only milk. The [line of] men who transmitted the dharma was, with this, severed. I say this story really cannot be true. Let me attempt to comment on it. As in the account of Mahākāśyapa, it is said, 'When the Buddha was about to pass into extinction, he said to Mahākāśyapa, "I am going to enter nirvāṇa. I entrust to you this profound dharma. In the future, you should honor and follow my intention. Broadly propagate and spread [the dharma]; do not allow it to be cut off."' How, then, could those of later generations who inherited from the Buddha and become patriarchs allow this dharma to be cut off?[9]

Qisong does not conceal his sheer disbelief that anyone could imagine such an end to the transmission of the dharma. His reaction reveals a profound belief in a particular pattern of dharma transmission. His acceptance of this pattern shapes the *Critical Essay* as a whole. He does not advocate it actively for he seems unable to contemplate any alternatives or to regard it, even for purposes of persuasion, as theory rather than fact. In Qisong's understanding, the Buddha did not warn of a possible loss of the dharma; he commanded that the dharma not be cut off, and therefore it cannot have been. In other words, Qisong takes the Buddha's words not as prescriptive—advice on what to try to prevent—but as descriptive of the future—a prediction of what will happen.

Despite his displeasure with the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* for the lack of certain details and the description of the end of the line of those who transmit dharma, Qisong accepts and indeed relies on its account of the dharma transmission up to Siṃha's death.[10] Hence he sees no difficulty in referring to two other incidents within it to underscore what he regards as the impossibility of Siṃha's death without a dharma heir.[11] In the first, the *Transmission of the Dharma-*

[9] *Critical Essay*, 773c26–774a6, the quotation a summary of T.2058.297b6, 12–13.

[10] Later in the *Critical Essay*, however, he shows great relief in finding other sources of the same material that are uncompromised by an end to the dharma transmission.

[11] The *Baolin Record* story of Bodhidharma being poisoned repeatedly and allowing himself to succumb only after having transmitted to an heir may also have influenced Qisong's reaction to Siṃha's situation (Tanaka, *Hōrinden yakuchū*, 378–79).

Treasury describes Upagupta delaying his death in order to await the birth of the much younger disciple to whom he will entrust the dharma; the second has Kāṇadeva foreseeing a violent death and yet succeeding in transmitting the dharma to Rāhula.[12] Siṃha seems, by contrast, an abysmal failure.

Qisong lays out in axiomatic form his interpretation of Siṃha's actions. If Siṃha is a patriarch, he must transmit the dharma to an heir, no matter the circumstances. If he does not transmit, he must not be a patriarch. These two statements form a single coherent principle, but then Qisong moves beyond his first vehement statement on the impossibility of the end of the dharma transmission to allow for one more possibility. If the line were to end, he asserts, Siṃha should have predicted it and announced it clearly. If he was unable to do this, he was not a patriarch. In other words, the line of dharma transmission can end, but that ending must be foretold and publicly broadcast. Thus Qisong does not view Buddhist history as necessarily dominated by a ceaseless transmission. He simply expects that the end of the transmission would occur in a proper manner, not abruptly and not without explanation.

Qisong is interested not only in defending the legitimacy of Chan lineage but also in preventing controversy. The fact that the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* has given rise to controversy he views as an offence against the sangha.[13] He extends this attitude to his expectations of patriarchs, who must behave so as to forestall such trouble. In this, he overlooks or ignores the overall tenor of the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury*, which places Siṃha's death in the context of the decline of the dharma, a process in which the best efforts of a few cannot prevent an inevitable slide away from the dharma and in which authority, both moral and scholarly, slowly decays. His condemnation of Siṃha is based on his belief that Siṃha had the power to continue the transmission and would not have been worthy of that power (and hence would not have inherited it) had he not exercised it; he does not entertain the notion that Siṃha might have been powerless.

Siṃha's dereliction of his duty to transmit the dharma (or to proclaim its impending cessation) simply serves to deepen Qisong's

[12] See *Critical Essay*, 764a, also on the need for prediction.

[13] The creation of dissension within the sangha is a monastic offence belonging to the second most serious group of transgressions.

suspicions about the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury*. Unsure whether the Sanskrit text or the translator is at fault, he reserves most of his criticism for the latter:

> If the Sanskrit original was initially written like this, one must question its credibility. [The translator] ought to have left these lacuna open, to await some future person [able to resolve them]. How could he so heedlessly pen such a tale, giving rise to debates in later generations at the expense of the sages of old? How can one not be frightened by this?[14]

Qisong here regards the translator as negligent but not deliberately misleading, but the circumstances under which the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* was produced will preoccupy Qisong throughout the *Critical Essay*, and his account of its creation shifts dramatically.

After faulting the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* for unreliability and internal contradictions, Qisong turns to other texts to counter it historically. He quotes from the *Jingde Record* a long passage in which a lay patron inquires about Chan patriarchs and is assured by "a tripiṭika master from the western regions named Jianna 犍那" of an unbroken line of thirty-seven generations of patriarchs from the seven Buddhas to the third Chinese patriarch Sengcan.[15] The layman then asks, in a statement possibly revealing about confusion during the Tang surrounding dharma transmission: "I once inspected the patriarchal charts. Some refer to more than fifty patriarchs, to the point that the branches are mixed up and lineages not fixed. Some are nothing more than empty names. How is one to verify any of this?"[16]

A "disciple of the sixth patriarch by the name of Zhiben 智本" comes forward with an explanation:

> This is because of the persecution of Buddhists in the Later Wei. At that time, there was a monk named Tanyao, who in a great hurry made a simple record of the names of all the patriarchs. He kept it when he fled to the mountains and wild fields…In the time of Emperor Xiaowen, Tanyao advanced to [the position of] Superintendent of Monks, and he released what he had recorded. Some monks used it to write a book, entitling it *Account of the Transmission of the Dharma*. It had lacunae

[14] *Critical Essay*, 774a17–20.

[15] *Critical Essay* 774a22. This account of Li Chang's query and Jianna's reply appears first in the *Baolin Record* (Tanaka, *Hōrinden yakuchū*, 443–45). The corresponding passage in the *Jingde Record* is 222a14–19.

[16] *Critical Essay*, 774a27–8.

and errors; it was incomplete. It is probably because of Tanyao's flight that it was like this.[17]

Zhiben does not mention translation or Kiṅkara as translator, only Tanyao as someone who under duress gathered names and who may or may not have added material to the list of names.[18]

Qisong's use of Zhiben's answer is peculiar given that the question concerns the problem of too many patriarchs rather than too few, as in the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury*. Still, this *Jingde Record* passage confirms Qisong's view of the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* as unreliable and at the same time provides an alternative history of an unbroken line of Indian and Chinese patriarchs. Qisong does not discuss the trustworthiness of the *Jingde Record* or acknowledge its reliance on the *Baolin Record* for Jianna and Zhiben's testimony, thus using it even more confidently than he will later use the work of distinguished figures like Sengyou and Huiyuan. The fact that Jianna and Zhiben are otherwise little known or unknown and appear to be either outright inventions or manipulations of little-known historical figures by the author of the *Baolin Record* weakens his argument significantly.[19]

But Qisong goes on to discuss—and defend—the *Baolin Record*. Is he simply carrying on with his stated task of examining both the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* and the *Baolin Record*, or is he signaling his awareness of the indebtedness of the *Jingde Record* passage to the *Baolin Record*? Whatever the answer, the *Baolin Record* comes out ahead of the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury*. Qisong remarks of the *Baolin Record* that "while the words are common and coarse, the narration tiresome and confusing, and it cannot be classified as a scholarly work, still the events it describes have a beginning and end. There is also justification for the number of generations and the names."[20] The *Baolin Record* is thus superior to the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury*, and yet Qisong is not without doubts. He writes, "Although there are some parts that accord with what is in

[17] *Critical Essay*, 774a29–b6. An interlinear note adds, "The *Account of the Transmission of the Dharma* is also said to have been written by Tanyao." This account appears in the *Jingde Record* at 222a21–7.

[18] See Tsukamoto Zenryū, "The Śramaṇa Superintendent T'an-yao and His Time."

[19] Jianna is otherwise unknown. Zhiben's name appears in the *Jingde Record* as a student of Huineng who left no record (235b6).

[20] *Critical Essay*, 774b9–11.

the canon, and it is not the work of another sect, I have long suspected that it was without justification and did not dare discuss it."[21] His appraisal is both honest and disingenuous, given his strategy of quoting the *Jingde Record* without mentioning its heavy use of the *Baolin Record*. This ploy, the historiographical equivalent of money-laundering, leaves Qisong's support of Chan lineage vulnerable. His awareness of this perhaps accounts for his enthusiasm for the next source he introduces.

The *Baolin Record* having been partially discredited as a source, Qisong seeks another. He reports finding in Sengyou's *Notes on the Translation of the Tripiṭaka* a section called "Record of the Table of Contents of the Account of the Transmission of the Sarvāstivāda Work."[22] This section of the *Notes on the Translation of the Tripiṭaka* consists of Sengyou's preface and summaries, mainly in the form of lists of names, of the five fascicles of this work, itself no longer extant.

With this text Qisong attempts to replace the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* and bolster the *Baolin Record* with the material provided by a reputable Chinese monk. That the work in question does not refer to a transmission of the dharma in the Chan sense or even in the exclusive "entrusting the dharma" sense used by the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* but instead to the transmission of (the vinaya of) the Sarvāstivāda school is clear, but Qisong nevertheless presents it with confidence that it concerns and supports Chan lineage.[23] He overlooks Sengyou's extended praise for the sustaining power of the vinaya in general and the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya in particular and focuses instead on the notion of a succession of men preserving the tradition and embodying virtue: "From Mahākāśyapa to Dharmatrāta, it spans two fascicles and contains in total more than a hundred names."[24] He does not make clear that the names Sengyou lists in these fascicles are two distinct versions of the same line of vinaya transmission; the first version lists Mahākāśyapa first with the name Dharmatrāta (whom Qisong takes to be Bodhidharma) repeated as number seventeen and

[21] *Critical Essay*, 774b13–14.

[22] T.2145.88c26–90a11. Here he combines the titles of Sengyou's preface and the summary of the work itself, which in the extant Taishō versions are "Preface to the Table of Contents of the Account of the Sarvāstivāda" and "Brief Account of the School Lineage of the Sarvāstivādin Buddhabhadra of the Neizhai gongsi in Chang'an."

[23] McRae understands this material to refer to the Sarvāstivādin meditation tradition, rather than vinaya (*The Northern School*, 79–80).

[24] *Critical Essay*, 774b19–20.

fifty-three (with close variants at twenty-four and forty-five), and the second version begins with Ānanda, not Mahākāśyapa, and lists a variant of the name Dharmatrāta as number fifty of a total of fifty-four.[25]

Despite these problems, the lists provide Qisong with a wealth of material to mine as he tries to establish that the line of transmission did not end with Siṃha. He moves through the first list identifying the patriarchs who followed Siṃha and thus connect him to Bodhidharma and China. Qisong links these names on the list with names of patriarchs in the Chan tradition. He disregards the positions of the four last Indian patriarchs since these—fifty, forty-nine, fifty-one, and fifty-three in the first list and forty-eight, forty-four, forty-nine, and fifty in the second—are out of order and yet places great importance on the fact that Bodhidharma, as Dharmatrāta, is the last listed in the first list. He explains away the disparity between names for the same figure, e.g. Poluoduoluo and Poshesiduo, as the consequence of the differing Indian dialects of the Indian monks responsible for the transliterations. He also accounts for the length of the lists as the result of Sengyou's combining different lists, including collateral disciples, and not eliminating repetitions.[26] He concludes, "Thus [the *Notes on the Translation of the Tripiṭaka*] is for the most part similar to the *Baolin Record* and the *[Jingde] Record of the Transmission of the Lamp*."[27]

In commending Sengyou and his account of the transmission, Qisong wonders that no one had earlier realized the significance of these lists for the lineage controversy:

> Because Sengyou was of the loftiest virtue, the people of his time praised him as a vinaya master. He was a man of learning and perception, and people have [continued to] praise him up to the present. As he grew up in the Qi 齊 and grew old in the Liang 梁, he must have heard these things in detail. His writings are certainly trustworthy. With his text, we can verify that although Siṃha bhikṣu died, his dharma was indeed transmitted and that the transmission of the four patriarchs following Poshe is not an error. It all becomes very clear, does it not? What the *[Jingde] chuandeng [lu]* records is surely based on fact.
>
> Alas, it has been almost one hundred years since Sengyou's book was included in the great canon and circulated throughout the world, and

[25] T.2145.89b29 and 90a8.

[26] Most of the collateral disciples of Siṃha named in the *Baolin Record* do appear in Sengyou's lists, but their arrangement in the *Baolin Record* is not mirrored in Sengyou's lists. Damoda, for example, appears before Siṃha.

[27] *Critical Essay*, 774c7–8.

> yet no one grasped what it reveals. How is it that the ancients did not see it? Whether a great man's virtues are neglected or celebrated is a matter of fate.[28]

Far more surprising than his predecessors not finding this material relevant is Qisong's willingness to believe that it is. He displays a wonderful ability to find certainty in ambiguous material as well as great faith that, despite previous confusion, the definitive truth may be found, either by him or those who will follow.

Proposing an Alternative History for Chinese Knowledge of the Dharma Transmission

As his remarks about Sengyou's life from the Qi to the Liang suggest, Qisong is concerned with the question of when knowledge of the transmission first reached China. He "quotes" from unidentified "earlier books" material (in fact, condensed from the *Baolin Record*) about a central Indian monk named Zhijianglianglou meeting in Kashmir an aged collateral heir of Siṃha named Damoda.[29] Damoda asserts that Siṃha foresaw his death and "properly transmitted the dharma to my fellow student, a śramana from southern India named Poshesiduo, also called Poluoduona."[30] Zhijiang turns out to have already heard of Poshesiduo, although it seems that he did not know him as Siṃha's heir since his original question to Damoda was about the "fate of the dharma after Siṃha died."[31] We are told that Zhijiang subsequently travelled to China. A monk by this name is said to have translated a text in Jiaozhou, in the far south, in 256, but the *Baolin Record* locates Zhijiang in Luoyang and attributes to him and a few other monks the translation of "many scriptures and episodes concerning the transmission of all the patriarchs."[32] Qisong concludes, "In this way, we know

[28] *Critical Essay*, 774c8–15.

[29] *Critical Essay*, 774c16. In the *Baolin Record* (Tanaka, *Hōrinden yakuchū*, 285–87, 296–98).

[30] *Critical Essay*, 774c22–3. In the *Baolin Record* (Tanaka, *Hōrinden yakuchū*, 290–91).

[31] *Critical Essay*, 774c19–20.

[32] *Critical Essay*, 774c28–9 and in the *Baolin Record* (Tanaka, *Hōrinden yakuchū*, 310–13). Mochizuki reports that Zhijiang was responsible for a translation of the *Fahua sanmei jing*, also known as the *Zheng fahua jing*, and the *Fahua youyi*, done in Jiaozhou in 256, or a year earlier according to one source, but that his date of death is unknown (v. 2, 1753–4).

that in China the first news of the patriarchs did not begin with the *Fu fazang zhuan* [*Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury*]."[33]

That the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* was not the first account of patriarchs is highly significant to Qisong. He argues that since Zhijiang translated texts on this topic almost two hundred years before Tanyao compiled the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury*, their contents must have circulated and been known. He also speculates that another, later version of these matters, which took the number of patriarchs beyond the twenty-five in Zhijiang's account, must have been carried east from India, though he admits that no one knows who brought it.[34]

In considering these issues, Qisong returns to the circumstances under which the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* was composed. The long *Jingde Record* passage Qisong quotes earlier in the essay includes Zhiben's speculation that Tanyao composed it in haste as he fled the Later Wei persecution of Buddhism. Qisong here suggests that:

> Kiṅkara and Tanyao, after the destruction of the teaching, drew on old texts to write a book. Then they combined it with sutras and promulgated it with the power of the state. At that time, even if there was private transmission of this matter, surely it could not equal the prestige of what was issued by Tanyao.[35]

Qisong does more than shift the time of composition from before the persecution to after it. His previous theory of Tanyao's hurried compilation of an incomplete lineage—a brave attempt to preserve—is not mentioned. Perhaps Qisong rejects this explanation altogether; it is unclear whether Tanyao's simple list would have been needed if old texts were available. Interestingly, Qisong does not directly criticize Tanyao or Kiṅkara for not listing their sources or explaining that there are gaps in the record. Nor does he address directly the presumed impropriety of a patched-together text being presented as a translation.

---

[33] *Critical Essay*, 774c29–775a1.

[34] *Critical Essay*, 775b4–6.

[35] *Critical Essay*, 775a6–9. After the revival of Buddhism under the Northern Wei, Tanyao held the position of Śramaṇa Superintendent, the highest post in the state bureau in charge of Buddhist activities. See Tsukamoto, "The Śramaṇa Superintendent T'an-yao and His Time."

Qisong emphasizes instead the power of the state to make a story seem more believable. He argues that Tanyao's imprimatur carried such weight that private transmission of a more complete and accurate version of the lineage could not have competed with it. Qisong goes on to say that despite Tanyao's promotion of it, the text was always a little suspicious, its origin too little understood, and "[f]or this reason, scholars believed in it less and less."[36] But, alas, it still caused trouble.

Curiously, when Qisong and his sources mention Kiṅkara, it is only as Tanyao's partner. His foreign origin seems not to add any cachet. One has no sense that he contributed knowledge of his own, as had previous Indians like Zhijiang and Jianna. Nor is it even clear that the "old texts" were in Sanskrit or any other foreign language and needed translation.

Qisong introduces yet another source of support for a transmission of the dharma that continued past Siṃha. Though he does not identify the source, it seems to be the *Jingde Record*. Nalianyeshe 那連耶舍, a Kasmiri monk active in translation in the mid-sixth century, supposedly told a Chinese colleague that the "twenty-seven patriarchs of the western land also honored this sutra."[37] Nalianyeshe apparently knew also of the transmission to Bodhidharma and predicted that Bodhidharma's Chinese heirs would be successful. Qisong tells us that additional information about this monk is to be found in the writings of Yang Xuanzhi 陽衒之 (d. 555), known as the author of the *Luoyang qielan ji* 洛陽伽藍記, who reports that this monk collaborated in India with another monk on Chinese translations of material about the patriarchs, which did not differ from that provided by Zhijiang, except that it extends the transmission to the twenty-seventh or twenty-eighth patriarch. Unfortunately, or perhaps tellingly, this reference cannot be found in Yang's sole known work.[38]

Qisong ultimately asserts that Zhijiang and Nalianyeshe are the fount of all information concerning the patriarchs: "[i]t is just that in

36 *Critical Essay*, 775a13–4.

37 *Critical Essay*, 775a14, 18. Nalianyeshe appears in the *Baolin Record* but only to provide Prajñātāra's gāthā. Yanagida believes Nalianyeshe to be none other than Fotuoyeshe of the *Lidai fabao ji*, "falsely included as a fellow student and given a gāthā, a truly ingenious move of the *Baolin Record*" (*Shoki zenshū*, 356).

38 Very little is known about Yang Xuanzhi, and I have found no reference to any works other than the *Luoyang qielan ji*. See Zhan Xiuhui, "*Luoyang qielan ji* de zuozhe yu chengshu niandai."

later generations each writer revised [the material] differently."[39] In the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury*, Tanyao and Kiṅkara, in other words, provide an improperly truncated revision, while the *Baolin Record* and *Jingde Record* are more accurate versions. Qisong emphasizes again Zhijiang's chronological proximity to Siṃha, just a generation removed, and brings Sengyou's contribution into the picture by noting that the Sarvāstivāda school originates in Kashmir, where Siṃha is said to have met his end.[40] Qisong defends Sengyou from any accusation or implication of Chan influence by pointing out that there were no disciples of Bodhidharma in China during Sengyou's lifetime and that the Sarvāstivāda school had no more reason to promote the Chan lineage than does Sengyou, a vinaya scholar.[41] This last remark confirms Qisong's complete misunderstanding (or disregard) of the Sarvāstivāda transmission lists provided by Sengyou. He overlooks the link between the Sarvāstivāda tradition and the vinaya made clear by Sengyou's preface, and he perceives the transmission lists as Chan, not Sarvāstivāda, such that Sarvāstivādins may be trusted as an impartial source on Chan lineage in India.

Refuting Shenqing

Qisong devotes the rest of this section to refuting a series of criticisms of Chan lineage history made by the Tang monk Shenqing. These include the vexing question of Bodhidharma's dates, the purpose for Bodhidharma's journey to China, and the very need for dharma transmission.[42]

In his *Beishan Record*, Shenqing points out a discrepancy between when Siṃha lived and when Bodhidharma was active in China so that Bodhidharma seems to have come east well before Siṃha lived. Qisong responds that in calculating the date of Siṃha's death, Shenqing has confused the title of a Wei emperor as prince of Qi with the much later dynasty of Southern Qi. But what most disturbs Qisong in Shenqing's

[39] *Critical Essay*, 775a29.
[40] *Critical Essay*, 775a29–b7.
[41] *Critical Essay*, 775b10–12
[42] In the *Record*, Qisong addresses another of Shenqing's arguments, on the question of whether arhats like Kāśyapa could transmit the dharma. See T.50.2078.725a–c.

discussion of dates is the description of Bodhidharma's motivation in coming to China.

Shenqing summarizes what he himself calls a false story, according to which Bodhidharma came to China because he heard that a disciple of his had been banished to Mt. Lu by the people of Qin.[43] In his outrage at this tale that Bodhidharma came to China because a disciple had run into difficulties, Qisong fails to notice Shenqing's dismissal of the story. Qisong identifies the disciple as Buddhabhadra, "a nephew of the school of Bodhidharma," and insists: "Now, as for the coming of the patriarch, he acted in accordance with great karmic conditions in order to transmit the mind-seal of the Buddha. How could he come simply because two disciples were banished? This is preposterous."[44] As in his objection to the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* account of Siṃha's death, Qisong demonstrates a highly teleological view of Chan history. There can be no accidents. Things happen for a reason, and the reason must be religiously meaningful. The lineage cannot end without announcement and explanation, and it cannot be carried to another land for a trivial purpose, without specific intent to transmit it there.

Qisong takes further umbrage at the following "irresponsible and reckless" statement by Shenqing: "As far as the gate of the patriarchs [i.e., Chan] is concerned, everyone in the world will flock to it in a return to [the principle of] benevolence. If one's virtues are naturally lofty, what need is there to rely on the dharma transmission and then establish a school?"[45] Shenqing here alludes to a portion of *Analects* 12.1 in which Confucius comments: "Restraining yourself and returning to the rites constitutes Goodness. If for one day you managed to restrain yourself and return to the rites, in this way you could lead the entire world back to Goodness. The key to Goodness lies within yourself – how could it come from others?"[46]

Shenqing here seems to be arguing that one should rely on oneself (and the Buddhist equivalent of the rites) rather than dharma transmission. From Qisong's point of view, however, dharma transmission is not a matter of strategy, choice or need; it is a fact. He again recounts the episode of the Buddha entrusting the dharma to

[43] *Critical Essay*, 775b14–17.
[44] *Critical Essay*, 775b23–5.
[45] T.52.611c21–22, quoted by Qisong at *Critical Essay*, 775b26–7.
[46] As translated by Slingerland, 125.

Mahākāśyapa. How can this succession, set in motion by the Buddha, be dismissed? Qisong asks, "Can these be the words of a follower of our [path]?"[47] In other words, how Shenqing be a Buddhist, much less an erstwhile Chan practitioner, while doubting that the Buddha set in motion a system of dharma-transmission? Shenqing further undermines himself in Qisong's eyes by using the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* to criticize the tradition of twenty-eight patriarchs and by refusing to regard Damoduoluo, or Dharmatrāta, as an alternate name for Bodhidharma.

Invective against Shenqing gives way to a renewed discussion of the *Baolin Record*. Qisong credits the *Baolin Record* with being correct about the names and nationalities of the patriarchs, which to his mind justifies his use of it, despite its exaggeration, repetition, errors, and lacunae. He understands these problems to have arisen because "the Western monks from whom [the tradition] was received spread it heedlessly and were not careful [about the details], and those who received the transmission were incapable of passing judgment on it."[48] He further laments the state of the material he must use:

> Chan monks are naive; their scholarship is unsophisticated. So their writings are roundabout and confused. They damaged the true works of ancient sages so that the stories did not meet with full acceptance in the world. Although they wish to extend [the dharma], on the contrary they end up shortening it. Writing books to pass on the dharma is surely the grand activity of sages and worthies. How could one write in this wanton manner? People of later generations, driven by a desire for fame, usurp what belongs to the ancients and compete in producing these stories. Is there no end to people like this? I often sigh over this.[49]

Qisong's seemingly unshakable confidence in and vehement defense of Chan lineage coexist with his awareness of the fallibility of the materials he must use to reconstruct it. His bald statement that Chan monks are not good with texts and hence do more harm than good reveals that he was quite aware of the weaknesses and flaws of his fellow followers of Bodhidharma and more than willing to blame them for discrepancies. He sees in their work not just incompetence but a shameful and dangerous hunger for fame.

---

47 *Critical Essay*, 775c3.
48 *Critical Essay*, 775c13–14.
49 *Critical Essay*, 775c15–20.

The first section concludes with a description of the organization of the *Record*, which helps confirm, as argued in the last chapter, that this section was originally composed as a self-contained and complete companion to that text, an outgrowth of the *pingyue* 評曰, or critical comments, in the *Record*.

Take Two: Armed with a New Source

The discovery of relevant material in the *Meditation Sutra* and its two prefaces by Huiyuan and Huiguan prompted Qisong to return to the issue of Chan history seven years after he composed the first section.[50] He writes of the *Meditation Sutra*:

> The names of the four patriarchs from Poshesiduo on are [made as] clear and obvious as if the sun and moon had been unveiled. What Sengyou recorded really has a basis [in fact], while Kiṅkara lacked accounts. [His work] is even less worthy of examination [than I thought before]. Scholars who have been arguing noisily with each other can also stop.[51]

Though Qisong had earlier drawn firm conclusions about the legitimacy of Chan lineage and the inaccuracy of the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury*, his relief at having found further evidence is palpable and underscores the anxiety he felt over the weakness of the evidence he had used earlier. He even admits that the proof provided by Sengyou's *Notes on the Translation of the Tripiṭaka* was too general to put an end to the dispute.[52] (He does not mention the extensive support he found in the *Baolin Record* or *Jingde Record*, only the *Notes on the Translation of the Tripiṭaka*.) The *Meditation Sutra* and its prefaces are, to his mind, very clear on the authenticity of the line of twenty-eight patriarchs and in particular corroborate the names of the contested last four Indian patriarchs. The *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* can finally be dismissed with confidence.

Qisong introduces and describes the *Meditation Sutra* before drawing from it the evidence he is so pleased to have. He asserts that it

---

[50] T.15.618.65b22–66a23 for Huiyuan's preface and text, the *Notes on the Translation of the Tripiṭaka*, 66b3–67a13 for Huiguan's preface. The *Notes on the Translation of the Tripiṭaka* also includes Huiyuan's preface, 65–66.

[51] *Critical Essay*, 776a7–10.

[52] *Critical Essay*, 776a4–5.

originated with Bodhidharma and was translated by Buddhabhadra;[53] Huiyuan and Huiguan then wrote prefaces for it. He explains that Bodhidharma was the direct heir of the dharma while Buddhabhadra was the disciple of Buddhasena and thus the "nephew of the dharma gate of Bodhidharma." (He does not state directly the relation between Bodhidharma and Buddhasena, but we can infer that they were co-disciples, or "dharma brothers.") Huiyuan and Huiguan were the disciples of Buddhabhadra. Hence, "[what] they recount of their patriarchs and lineage is surely properly detailed and complete."[54]

Qisong quotes from the *Meditation Sutra* a passage listing "honored ones."[55] He parses this list of nine names in a curious fashion. The first is the earliest patriarch, and the last is the twenty-seventh (i.e., Bodhidharma's master). These names and numbers, he says, accord with the *Baolin Record* and the *Jingde Record*, although no numbers are given here, and the names are not exactly the same.[56] He explains that the list appears in an abbreviated form because Bodhidharma was concentrating on the topic of meditation but "[o]ne knows, however, that the rest of the patriarchs are in the middle."[57]

Qisong quotes Huiguan's preface for a description of the transmission of the last few Indian patriarchs as well as information about Buddhasena. He identifies each of these patriarchs with Chan numbering and refers to Buddhasena as a co-pupil of Bodhidharma. He sees only slight discrepancies between this account and those of the *Baolin Record* and the *Jingde Record*.

He goes to Huijiao's biographical work, the *Gaoseng zhuan*, and to the *Notes on the Translation of the Tripiṭaka* for further information on Buddhasena and Buddhabhadra. Huijiao confirms that Buddha-

---

[53] Near the end of the text, Qisong writes, "Bodhidharma appeared in the generations after the Tathāgata. However, his work is called the *Meditation Sutra*. His text is so named because he used many sutras for the purpose of taking the words of the Buddha as a standard and awakening later generations" (*Critical Essay*, 783c3–6).

Lin Li-kouang has examined the history and content of the *Meditation Sutra* and concludes that it is a work by Buddhasena to which the name of Dharmatrāta has erroneously been added, due to confusion with a generic Yogacārābhūmi sutra work with similar title and content by Dharmatrāta (*L'aide-mémoire de la vraie loi*, 344f).

[54] *Critical Essay*, 776a16–7.

[55] Not an exact quote. The passage he quotes ends with the lines: "All those who held the dharma passed on this lamp of wisdom one to another. Now I explain this meaning as I have heard it" (*Critical Essay*, 776a25–7, *Meditation Sutra*, 301c9–10).

[56] *Critical Essay*, 776b4.

[57] *Critical Essay*, 776b7.

sena was Buddhabhadra's teacher and provides details of Buddhabhadra's journey to China and encounter with Kumārajīva. Qisong continues the story with Buddhabhadra's expulsion from the capital by Kumārajīva's disciples, which led to his stay at Huiyuan's community at Mt. Lu, where he translated the *Meditation Sutra*. Sengyou repeats this attribution in his catalogue.

Qisong pauses to clarify the link between Bodhidharma and Buddhabhadra, i.e., Buddhasena. He takes Buddhasena to be, like Bodhidharma, a student of Prajñātāra. In fact, Huiyuan attributes the *Meditation Sutra* to both Bodhidharma and Buddhasena. The *Baolin Record*, however, reverses the relationships, making Buddhasena and Bodhidharma the students of Buddhabhadra, who taught them "the dhyāna and samādhi of the Hīnayāna."[58] (Although he does not refer to it here, Qisong may also be influenced by Huiguan's understanding of the relations between three figures. Huiguan first describes Buddhasena as a co-disciple with Dharmatrāta and then as a student of Buddhabhadra, himself a student of Dharmatrāta.)[59] Qisong first wonders if this is not an example of a reciprocal teaching relationship between the representatives of Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna, which he regards as commonplace in India. If so, Buddhabhadra could then have become the student of Bodhidharma and the "great dharma" he represented. After considering this scenario, Qisong comments that "even sages must have teachers" but then retreats from this explanation on the strength of Bodhidharma's precocity and identity as an avatar of Avalokiteśvara.[60] After all, Bodhidharma "was particularly skilled in the matter of samādhi. What need was there for him to learn from others?"[61] Qisong accounts for mistakes in the *Baolin Record* by blaming a familiar scapegoat: "Perhaps the western monks who transmitted [the material found] in the *Baolin [zhuan]* were not yet refined."[62] For, if Buddhabhadra were Bodhidharma's teacher, why would he have been transmitting his student's sutra in China?[63] Buddhabhadra is instead Bodhidharma's "nephew."

---

[58] *Critical Essay*, 776c18–20.

[59] *Notes on the Translation of the Tripiṭaka*, 66c25–6. Lin discusses this (*L'aide-mémoire de la vraie loi*, 349, n. 6).

[60] *Critical Essay*, 776c24–5.

[61] *Critical Essay*, 776c27.

[62] *Critical Essay*, 776c29.

[63] It seems most likely that, as Lin explains, quoting Zhisheng's catalog, the *Kaiyuan lu*, that Buddhasena wrote the *Meditation Sūtra*, also known as the *Xiuxing fang-*

Another remark in the *Baolin Record* requires some explanation from Qisong: "Buddhabhadra once said to dharma master Huiyuan, 'In the western land, there have already been twenty-seven-patriarchs.'"[64] Why did he not give the number twenty-eight? The answer is linked to the issue of dates. The *Meditation Sutra* was translated around 411–413, but Bodhidharma came to China sometime in 520–526. This, Qisong asserts, is possible because of Bodhidharma's incredible longevity. Qisong implies that time does not bind one who rose from his grave but nevertheless goes on to calculate that Bodhidharma must have been just twenty-seven when Buddhabhadra translated the sermon. He speculates that Buddhabhadra had seen that Bodhidharma would inherit the dharma. Although Bodhidharma had not yet succeeded his master Prajñātāra, he was still capable of preaching something worth transmitting to China. Qisong praises Buddhabhadra for his foresight that Bodhidharma would be the successor and adds that Buddhabhadra was himself a remarkable man.

In the case of the prefaces to the *Meditation Sutra*, as with several other texts, Qisong finds a patriarchal lineage where there seems not to be one. Whereas the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* refers to a line of monks entrusted with the dharma, Huiguan calls a few of the figures "heads of the teaching," and Huiyuan writes of Bodhidharma and Buddhasena as "leading talents of the Western regions, models of meditation teaching."[65] Huiguan's description seems to point at nothing more than an idea that each generation contains one outstanding teacher who serves as a leader to the community, and even this is circumscribed by his references to Kashmir, a particular area in which these men served as "heads of the teaching." Huiguan, meanwhile, does not appear to attribute to these monks an exclusive and Buddha-like authority. Huiyuan acknowledges not only Bodhidharma but also Buddhasena, treating them as equals in talent. Qisong quotes these sections of both the prefaces, but he does not notice or remark on the discrepancy between his vision of Chan lineage and the sources he is using to ground it. Indeed, he relishes these descriptions.

---

bian jing and Buddhabhadra, his student, translated it (*L'aide-mémoire de la vraie loi*, 346, n. 2).

[64] *Critical Essay*, 777a7–8.

[65] *Notes on the Translation of the Tripiṭaka*, 66c23,26–7, and *Meditation Sutra*, 301b9–10, *Notes on the Translation of the Tripiṭaka*, 66a11–12. In the second phrase, the term "meditation" can be read as "Chan."

Qisong returns to the question of when word of the patriarchate reached China and elaborates on the narrative he had worked out earlier. The transmission begins with the work of Zhijiang, which was then lost when in 446 the Northern Wei ruler Tuoba Dao 拓拔燾 (r. 423–452) began a persecution of Buddhism that lasted until his death in 452. Tanyao and Kiṅkara patched together a book "sometimes complete, sometimes riddled with holes."[66] And then, Qisong contends, this was lost in the persecutions of Buddhism under the Zhou emperor Wu 武 (r. 561–579) and the Tang emperor Wuzong 武宗 (r. 840–846): "[a]lthough those of later generations again gathered and combined [material] to make a book, the gap between the complete [original] and the incomplete [reconstruction] increased."[67] By extending the corruption of the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* later and later in history and blaming each persecution for the loss of material and the subsequent confusion over the truth, Qisong suggests that destroying the true history of Buddhism was in fact a primary goal or result of state persecution.

In this version, Qisong blames Tanyao and considers scholars gullible. Kiṅkara is not responsible; it is just his name that was used. Since the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* was written well after the *Meditation Sutra* and in an area then wracked by war, Qisong considers it impossible to favor such a disreputable source over the *Meditation Sutra*: "Is it right to cling to a book that appeared later in just one region in order to supplement a lost text and challenge what is found in a complete text that appeared earlier?"[68]

Qisong comes to a dramatic conclusion.

> If the truth is that there was no one to whom the dharma was transmitted, those who are knowledgeable [would] write [about it] directly. They would simply not write about one who had inherited the dharma, and people would see for themselves the lack [of dharma heirs]. What need is there to write that the transmission is cut off? These words are cruel and coarse. Indeed, someone who was not satisfied with the aftermath of the destruction of the teaching took delight in the disappearance of the text about lineage and availed himself of the affair of Siṃha to forge something incorrect about dharma heirs. Then he spread [this fiction] under the name of the Indian monk Kiṅkara. However, Kiṅkara (Jijiaye)

[66] *Critical Essay*, 777a29.
[67] *Critical Essay*, 777b1–2.
[68] *Critical Essay*, 777b11–3.

> is also named Jifuyan. Many say he wrote the *Wuming ji* [in which the transmission] does not stop at twenty-four generations.[69]

In other words, the content of the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* is so dreadful that it must be the result of forgery, some deliberate, malicious attempt to harm the dharma by denying the lineage. Qisong's ideas of what is possible surface again when he argues that had there been no transmission, it would have been discussed directly and there would be no other stories.

Qisong also introduces the idea that Kiṅkara (Jijiaye) was also known as Jifuyan, a monk to whom is attributed a work acknowledging more than twenty-four patriarchs. It is a scenario difficult to pursue since the work in question is neither extant nor well-described in catalogues, and biographical information is scant for the monk of either name.

In the dramatic conclusion to this section, Qisong proposes another possible explanation for the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* that does not alter his final pronouncement on it.

> Even if Tanyao did not write [the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury*] at that time, another person must have done it after the Zhou emperor Wu's destruction of the teaching. Otherwise, how could it be that both the *Meditation Sutra* and *Notes on the Translation of the Tripiṭaka* are complete, and it is so lacking. I say this erroneous book can be burnt.[70]

The idea that the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* arose as late as Emperor Wu's persecution is new and without support, but it does not alter Qisong's conclusion that the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* should be destroyed. And so, although Qisong sometimes adopts a tone of sadness at the controversy caused by the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury*, he ends with an angry accusation of malice.

Qisong seems to have felt strongly that the material he introduces in this section of the *Critical Essay* allows him to make a definitive and powerful case against the *Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury* and for the legitimacy of Chan lineage. A close reading of the material, primarily the *Meditation Sutra*, and Qisong's analysis of it reveals how eager he is to see support where there is none. And despite the relief he so clearly feels to have found this material, he resorts, as he

[69] *Critical Essay*, 777c1–7.
[70] *Critical Essay*, 777c8–10.

had in the first section, to constant—one might say nervous—revision of his arguments.

Conclusion

In the first section of the *Critical Essay*, annotation in the form of interlinear notes is limited and consists mostly of the addition of small details. The second section, however, contains interlinear notes that take the argument in the main text in new directions and present additional support. We can assume that they were written after the composition of the section, but it is difficult to know when, perhaps after the section had circulated and garnered reactions that prompted Qisong to clarify and develop his arguments. There is also the strong possibility that they were added in the interval after the work had been accepted into the imperial canon and before the printing blocks were carved, when he could not alter the main text but could annotate it in this way.

Whenever they were written, the annotations serve to demonstrate Qisong's ingenuity at dealing with discrepancies and inconsistencies. To give one example, when confronting the fact that different works give different death dates for Bodhidharma's supposed teacher Prajñātāra, Qisong tries out a number of possible explanations before finally drawing an analogy to uncertainties about the death date of the Buddha himself.

> In examining this, [we find that] perhaps after Buddhabhadra, Huiguan translated the texts of this sutra again and wrote a preface for it himself. Perhaps he received a general account saying that Prajñātāra entered nirvāṇa [at a particular time] and thereupon recorded it. Perhaps the two Indian monks from whom [the author of the] *Baolin [zhuan]* and Huiguan received accounts belonging to different schools and lineages. Perhaps the general accounts of the five regions of India were not accurate. Perhaps by the time it was transmitted to this land, much time had passed [and] because of over-reliance on sutras and under-estimation of the teachings [of the different schools], those who transmitted the writing made errors that led to lacunae and confusion. I use only the dharma-inheriting patriarchs [in the accounts]. As for the precise years when they entered nirvāṇa, it does not matter very much even if there are slight differences. It is like the stories of the multitude of schools not agreeing on the birthday of the Buddha. How could I say it is not our Buddha?[71]

[71] *Critical Essay*, 776b15–8.

This passage captures well two of the features of Qisong's historical writing: his ability to speculate about history and his propensity to assert, despite a lack of evidence, that the dharma transmission is as fundamental a reality as the very birth of the Buddha.

These two qualities—a deep-seated belief in Chan dharma transmission and wide-ranging historical knowledge and imagination deployed to meet challenges to that dharma transmission—shape Qisong's historical writing. Because the *Critical Essay* was written in stages, preserving different formulations of Qisong's arguments, we can see that belief, knowledge, and imagination in action. Qisong reveals to his readers his awareness of and discomfort with the portions of his presentation of Chan lineage that cannot be adequately documented. He professes his relief when he discovers better support. How curious, then, that it is precisely his elaborate speculations and piecing together of evidence that has brought down the attacks of contemporaries and modern scholars. Qisong believes in Chan lineage, but he also recognizes and believes in the need for historical proof. Even when he reads Chan lineage into all the sources available to him, the two do not always align. In those moments, and those moments only, he seems to assert that not all can be known through history.

The following chapter will extend this analysis to the final section of the *Critical Essay*, in which Qisong addresses less technical, more theoretical issues of Chan lineage. As we will see, his arguments become more coherent and convincing once he is able to leave behind the welter of conflicting sources that trouble him so in the sections discussed above.

CHAPTER SIX

QISONG ON LINEAGE: THE *CRITICAL ESSAY* REVISED AND DEFENDED

Introduction: A Different Format, a Different Scope, a Different Attitude

The second fascicle of the *Critical Essay* takes the form of a series of questions and answers.[1] The questions derive, in all likelihood, from reactions to the two sections of the first fascicle, which were circulated in the years after the composition of the first in the early 1050s and then the second in the late 1050s or very early 1060s. Qisong presents the questions in the voice of an unidentified 'visitor' or 'guest' who expresses skepticism on many points, including several made earlier in the *Critical Essay*, and then he responds at length in his own voice.

The third section differs from the earlier sections of the *Critical Essay* in three ways. First, the topics discussed are more theoretical and acknowledge a wider Buddhist context for the issues surrounding Chan lineage. Qisong's answers draw very little on the historical sources used previously, turning instead to a number of sūtras and commentaries, particularly the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* and the *Da zhidu lun*.[2] Second, Qisong here confronts directly the questions and

[1] The question-and-answer format had long been used in Indian Buddhism and traditional Chinese literature as well as Chinese Buddhist material. One of its permutations is the master-disciple conversation of Chan *yulu*, or discourse records. In the *Chan Preface* [Chanyuan zhuquanji duxu] of Zongmi, these conversations are criticized—by a questioner—as disorganized (T.48.2015.399c28–9), and the same certainly applies here. Although this section of the text shows fewer signs of rapid composition than those that precede it and is somewhat less self-contradictory, Qisong does return to topics repeatedly. As a result, in my analysis, I have grouped together passages that are related while also taking their immediate context into account.

[2] Qisong calls the first text simply the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra* and seems to be using a text identical or very close to Huiyan's translation (T.12.375). Chün-fang Yü recently summed up scholarship on the *Da zhidu lun*: "Because no Sanskrit or Tibetan version of this text is extant, some Western Buddhologists have cast doubt on the received tradition in Chinese Buddhism, which says that this text was authored by Nāgārjuna and translated by Kumārajīva. While E. Lamotte, A.K. Warder, and more recently Christian Lindtner question the traditional attribution of Nāgārjuna as its author, David Seyfort Ruegg suggests that it might be a Central Asian (or Serindian) work which

reactions of those not already convinced—and not necessarily respectful—of Chan lineage. He does not soften the tone of doubt driving most of the questions, even when he is aware that his answers are not always persuasive. Third, one finds less anxious revisiting of the weak points of Qisong's defense of Chan lineage. By this time, he is confident that the *Meditation Sūtra* and its prefaces have put to rest any doubts about the legitimacy of Chan lineage, and this conviction seemingly frees him to write expansively about the nature and significance of the lineage in ways that Chan monks rarely have.

Many of the questions and answers revolve around the 'problem' of the *Meditation Sūtra*. This work, the linchpin in his defense of Chan lineage, itself requires defense. It appears to be a straightforward meditation text of the Sarvāstivādin school and yet was authored, Qisong believes, by Bodhidharma. In the process of making sense of this apparent incongruity, Qisong addresses many issues of interest: the history and nature of the text and its prefaces, the relation of the mind-to-mind transmission to the outward teachings of the Buddha, the secrecy often surrounding dharma transmission, the history of the 'separate' dharma transmission as the inner or secret history of Buddhism, and the branching of the lineage into more than one line after Huineng.

In the earlier sections, Qisong strives to lay out how, in his view, the dangerously misleading *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* came about and gained credence despite the accurate information about the transmission already circulating in China. Here, albeit in a less than organized fashion, he attempts a grander reconstruction of the story of true lineage—from its origin to periods of concealment, triumph, and external decline—within the known history of Buddhism. Along the way, he paints a picture of the figures, the patriarch-bodhisattvas, who make up the lineage and, in his view, are the leaders of Buddhism as a whole. This attempt to construct a narrative that goes beyond a series of often formulaic biographies of patriarchs demonstrates, among other things, Qisong's understanding of the power of the lineage myth and of its importance as an object of reverence.

Kumārajīva and his Chinese collaborators translated. There is so far no scholarly consensus on this issue" ("Review of Alan Cole's *Mothers and Sons in Chinese Buddhism*," 343, typographical errors corrected).

The 'Problem' of the *Meditation Sūtra*

The *Meditation Sūtra*, as an early and respectable work with a preface by the eminent monk Huiyuan, is the linchpin of Qisong's defense of Chan authority. For some critics, however, Qisong's reliance on the *Meditation Sūtra* raises issues rather than resolving them. The first of these issues, introduced in the initial question, is not specific to the *Meditation Sūtra* at all. It concerns an apparent contradiction at the heart of the Chan tradition, the contradiction between a lineage supposedly based on ultimate realization transcending language and a history, recorded in texts, of such a lineage:[3]

> A visitor said to me, "I hear that the true lineage is passed from mind to mind only, but you keep alluding to the *Meditation Sūtra*. Why is that?"[4]

Sidestepping the real thrust of this question—the relation of historical data to a mind-to-mind transmission—Qisong defends his use of this specific text.

> I allude to the *Meditation Sūtra* because of the names and numbers of patriarchs that appear in it. It is full of subtle meaning which accords with our true lineage. The narration of the true lineage by the great master of Mt. Lu [Huiyuan] is particularly detailed, as is the preface of Huiguan. When I wrote of it, I presented it merely as evidence. I do not mean to concentrate my attention on the study of the *Meditation Sūtra*.[5]

Despite the reference to "subtle meaning," Qisong distinguishes between the reliability of the *Meditation Sūtra* as a source of information about Chan lineage and the importance of its content. He might seem simply to be repudiating the *Meditation Sūtra* as anything other

[3] Scholars have suggested that the Chan school needed a lineage precisely because it did not base itself on a particular sūtra or commentary. This makes a shift to historical texts almost inevitable. As Foulk demonstrates, fine examples of this contradiction may be seen in the development (and increasingly early attribution of) the famous four-phrase Chan slogan and the story of the Buddha silently transmitting the dharma to Mahākāśyapa with a smile and the offer of a flower ("Sung Controversies Concerning the 'Separate Transmission' of Ch'an," 265–9). Schlütter has also written about inheritance certificates (*How Zen Became Zen*, 63–5), a fascinating result of the need to document an ineffable transmission. As Schlütter emphasizes, these certificates were both revered as manifest proof of lineage and coveted as a necessary credential for monks ambitious to serve as public monastery abbots.

[4] *Critical Essay*, 777c16–7.

[5] *Critical Essay*, 777c17–20. I have altered the Taishō punctuation.

than a source of historical material, but Qisong's appraisal of the text proves to be more complex. His answer here points to a problem with the *Meditation Sūtra*, not that it is a text per se, but that it is a particular kind of text, a meditation sūtra representing something close to an orthodox Sarvāstivāda position, a far cry from the Mahāyāna tradition with which the vast majority of Chinese Buddhists had long identified.[6]

In the latter half of the first fascicle, Qisong was pleased to be able to quote from the *Meditation Sūtra* and Huiyuan's preface lists of 'patriarchs' without mentioning the general content of the *Meditation Sūtra*. Here he widens his treatment of the text and its prefaces to the seeming mismatch between the Chan patriarch Bodhidharma and a scripture describing basic meditation techniques. The questioner asks about the doctrinal identification of the content of the *Meditation Sūtra*:

> [W]hat appears in the *Meditation Sūtra* is only the thirty-seven items and four contemplations. All of these are the ways and marks of the Hīnayāna. Yet you say it comes from Bodhidharma. How can this be right?[7]

In response, Qisong first quotes the *Da zhidu lun* to the effect that these methods of cultivation and contemplation are common to the Mahāyāna as well and that bodhisattvas must pursue all paths of study.[8] He goes on:

> Now Bodhidharma, as a great bodhisattva-monk, transmitted the dharma as a patriarch. He preached the *Meditation Sūtra* to circulate the Mahāyāna dharma. Indeed, this was proper. How can anyone doubt it? Even if the four contemplations belong only to the path of the Hīnayāna, the *Da zhidu lun* also says, "Subhūti, in this way, a bodhisattva studies all the dharmas and internally achieves purity; this is the mind of the

---

[6] Florin Deleanu, "Śrāvakayāna Yoga Practices and Mahāyāna Buddhism," 4, 5–6. Deleanu outlines the reasons for his rejection of Demiéville's conclusion that the *Meditation Sūtra* contains a Mahayanist interpolation ("Appendice sur 'Damoduoluo' (Dharmatrāta)," 48). See also Yamabe, "*The Sūtra on the Ocean-like Samādhi of the Visualization of the Buddha.*"

[7] *Critical Essay*, 779c17–19. The thirty-seven items are the thirty-seven bodhipākṣikā, methods of practical cultivation used by the bodhisattva. The four contemplations, or *catvāri smṛty-upasthānāni*, are included within the thirty-seven. They consist of contemplation of the impurity of the body, suffering, the impermanence of the mind, and the lack of inherent essence of dharmas (Nakamura, 472, 528–9, citing the *Viṃalakīrti Sūtra*, T.14.475.538–42).

[8] *Critical Essay*, 779c19–780a3.

> śrāvaka and the pratyeka buddha."[9] It also says, "A bodhisattva in this way understands the tendencies of the minds of all beings."[10] It also says, "The thirty-seven items are the śrāvaka and pratyeka buddha's path to nirvāṇa."[11] The Buddha urges the bodhisattva to follow this path. In this way, then, the bodhisattva also achieves the dharma of the śrāvaka and advances human understanding.
>
> Now the *Meditation Sūtra* expounds upon it. Is this not following the intention of the Buddha? Why is it not justified? Furthermore, it does not treat people with the Hīnayāna at all. In the *Meditation Sūtra*, the patriarch Bodhidharma first, with expedient means, teaches the practices of the three vehicles. He does this because of the shallowness [of some people's understanding] and then guides them deeper.[12]

Qisong defends the *Meditation Sūtra* and Bodhidharma from accusations of Hīnayāna teachings by asserting that bodhisattvas master all practices, even simplistic and incomplete teachings, in order to be able to teach. In the end, he goes farther, suggesting that when used as part of a progression to Mahāyāna doctrine such teachings cannot be considered Hīnayāna at all.

The surprising assertion that the *Meditation Sūtra* is not, as one might think, a mere "Hīnayāna" treatise on meditation has a counterpart in the presentation of Bodhidharma. Qisong describes him as "a great bodhisattva-monk" rather than as a master for only the most advanced and devoted students. Qisong does not believe that Bodhidharma limited himself to mind-to-mind transmission, a point he makes clear through another exchange with his interlocutor.

> I have also heard that Prajñātāra transmitted to Bodhidharma only the medicine of the great dharma and commanded him to deal directly with people of superior faculties. [This method is] outside scriptures and teachings and not dependent on words; it points directly at the human mind and achieves complete enlightenment. I have not heard that he also followed the ways and signs of the Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna for the sake of his preaching.[13]

Qisong answers that when Prajñātāra spoke of the medicine of the great dharma, he surely meant that Bodhidharma should "observe

---

[9] T.25.1509.605a13–15. Qisong drops a character in the second phrase; in the original, it translates, "This purity is the mind of the śrāvaka and the pratyeka buddha."

[10] T.25.1509.605a22–23. Qisong skips a phrase without altering the meaning.

[11] Blending of T.25.1509.197b16–7 and c2–3.

[12] *Critical Essay*, 780a3–14.

[13] *Critical Essay*, 780a21–4.

[people's varying] faculties in order to carry out the teaching that had been rightly transmitted to him."[14] As Qisong explains, Bodhidharma did encounter people worthy of the medicine of the great dharma and dealt with them directly, as instructed. He continues:

> For over a hundred years before Bodhidharma entered China, the *Meditation Sūtra* was limited to the western regions because the time for transmission had not come and those of superior facilities were few. Thus, in accordance with people's [varying] facilities and the expedient means required, [Buddhist masters] had to rely on either the Mahāyāna or the Hīnayāna to expound the teaching provisionally. Bodhidharma once did this, too. As it is said [in the *Da zhidu lun*], bodhisattvas exhaust all the paths of study to understand the inclinations of the minds of all beings. However, the way of the patriarchs does not stop with this. As for the saying "not depending on words, pointing directly at the human mind, dealing directly with those of superior facilities," the *Meditation Sūtra* already implies it, but it had not yet been uncovered. When the time came, Bodhidharma made up his mind to come east. He took advantage of China possessing the spirit of the Mahāyāna. Therefore, what he rightly transmitted began to prosper widely in the Liang and Wei. Scholars little realize. They see only that [the *Meditation Sūtra*] uses words to preaching the calming and contemplation of the three vehicles and say therefore that they are not the words of Bodhidharma. How reckless they are![15]

Thus, to Qisong's mind, the command to teach the most advanced students does not preclude teaching others in the ways most conducive to their progress. Indeed, as a bodhisattva Bodhidharma was obligated to teach in this way. But "the way of the patriarchs" offers more than expedient means, and when the time was right, Bodhidharma transmitted the "great dharma."

Even though Qisong asserts that Bodhidharma did teach using expedient means, he refuses to identify the *Meditation Sūtra* as merely the product of Bodhidharma's compassion to the less advanced among his students. He sees the "way of the patriarchs" concealed in the *Meditation Sūtra*. Consider his response to the question, "Why do you say 'The *Meditation Sūtra* has subtle meaning which accords with our lineage?'"[16] Qisong quotes from the *Meditation Sūtra* an unremarkable

[14] *Critical Essay*, 780b1.
[15] *Critical Essay*, 780b4–15.
[16] *Critical Essay*, 778c12–3.

passage about the need for assiduous cultivation and comments on the three terms of transliterated Sanskrit that appear in it:

> The *Meditation Sūtra* is two fascicles. From beginning to end, it is all in Chinese. Only for this awakening [abhisamaya], the best teaching in the world [dharma], and the core of the single scripture [manaskāra] is Sanskrit used. [They] keep them secret by not translating them. In this way, our scholiasts contain the subtle meaning of the Buddha. They particularly want [people] to awaken and cross over by means of the secret. They hope people will think about the truth by means of this.[17]

In other words, what appears to be a straightforward text on basic meditation techniques contains, in the form of untranslated Sanskrit, a subtle indication that there is a higher truth than that communicated by this text. This is an odd argument, to say the least, and since the transliteration is the work of the translator Buddhabhadra rather than the supposed author Bodhidharma, it implicitly requires us to assume that these two, linked by lineage, were of one mind. But how was this higher truth conveyed in the presumed original Sanskrit? Qisong seems not to perceive this difficulty, simply going on to provide further examples in the *Meditation Sūtra* of intimations of the Mahāyāna and of the true lineage itself. To this purpose, he plays a game of connect-the-dots. The *Meditation Sūtra* refers in this passage to "contemplating the true meaning" and "the sword of sagely behavior"; Qisong takes the former as a clear command to look beneath the surface of the *Meditation Sūtra* itself and turns to the *Da zhidu lun* for an identification of the latter with the "three gates of liberation," which, Qisong tells us, are found in both the Mahāyāna and the Hīnayāna.[18] He follows with further examples of his talent at glimpsing the secret lineage in run-of-the-mill Buddhist language by quoting a few suggestive verses from various places in the *Meditation Sūtra*:

> The Buddha, using but a small portion of his wisdom
> explained briefly the nature of all dharmas.
> Perfect meaning like this
> is the object of the ten powers and wisdoms.[19]

---

[17] *Critical Essay*, 778c21–4.

[18] *Critical Essay*, 778c24–9. The line from the *Da zhidu lun* may be found at T.25.1509.197a21.

[19] *Critical Essay*, 779a3–4 quoting T.15.618.314b9–10.

Qisong does not comment directly here, but later he quotes the same lines again and remarks,

> This might have been a modest expression of the patriarch. His meaning is this: this scripture is merely my general provisional explanation of this dharma nature. As for the ultimate principle, it is the spiritual state of the Buddha, secret and subtle, inexpressible in words and explanations. It must be reached by the secretly transmitted marvelous awakening alone.[20]

He quotes the final two lines of the *Meditation Sūtra*.

> Expedient means govern the practice of the stages
> to arrive at perfection.
> The contributor of the unsurpassed dharma
> bestows it, passing it on to the present.[21]

He comments that the first phrase refers to expounding the *Meditation Sūtra* and the second to "rightly transmitting the great dharma [by] dealing directly with those of superior faculties."[22] The next line "refers to what Bodhidharma himself said about inheriting what the Buddha transmitted, and it continues to the present day."[23] Aside from the "abbreviated" list of nine names, these two brief passages, along with another in the same vein, are the only material Qisong culls from the two fascicles of the *Meditation Sūtra*. But they serve to convince him that the *Meditation Sūtra* is far more than a mere Hīnayāna meditation text.

It is difficult to sum up Qisong's assessment of the *Meditation Sūtra* because, as in earlier sections, his arguments often proliferate in a way that leads to self-contradiction. In this case, he first asserts that the *Meditation Sūtra* is useful historical material only, not intended for intensive study. But, in the same breath, he notes that it does have subtle meaning. He insists that it is not Hīnayānist but that Bodhidharma taught it because he was a bodhisattva and taught as needed. He tries to prove that the *Meditation Sūtra* contains hints of the lineage and of teachings beyond itself. While a clear-cut final opinion is not forthcoming, Qisong's way of writing preserves for us every layer of

---

[20] *Critical Essay*, 780b17–20, altering the Taishō punctuation so the second line begins *yiwei* 意謂, not *jinjing* 今經.
[21] *Critical Essay*, 779a4–6 and 780b20–1, quoting T.15.618.325b1–2.
[22] *Critical Essay*, 780b22–5.
[23] *Critical Essay*, 780b25–6.

his thinking on the topic, and at all times and in all ways, however tangled the argument becomes, he defends the *Meditation Sūtra* as a source of legitimacy for Chan lineage.

Perhaps most interesting is the way in which Qisong, indebted to the *Meditation Sūtra* as a source for historical information about the patriarchs, goes on to invest the meditation text itself with profound meaning. While this might be chalked up to a stubborn and irrational allegiance to his lineage, it also exposes some of his assumptions about how the transmission is known and understood—or not. The *Meditation Sūtra* does not disclose the transmission, but Qisong believes that it does not conceal it either.

Texts, Secrecy, and the 'Separate Transmission Outside Teachings'

Qisong's discovery of the "subtle meaning" of the *Meditation Sūtra* suggests that he expects texts, and, in a broader sense, language to be able to convey at least some of the truth of the transmission to some people. What, then, is the 'separate transmission outside teachings'? How and why is it separate? What is the role of texts for a school based on such a transmission?

These questions arise in part from critics who ask why Qisong engages in historical and textual studies on behalf of his school. Although at the beginning of the third section, Qisong evades a question on the necessity of textual proof for a mind-to-mind transmission, he confronts this issue directly in relation to a different text. While the later question concerns the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra*, it comes on the heels of his appraisal of the *Meditation Sūtra* and offers him a chance to expound in general terms on the relation between Chan lineage and the texts that he believes support it.

The questioner asks, "What is called 'the separate transmission outside teachings' is not linked to the teachings, but you insist on taking the words of the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra* as proof. Can this be right?"[24] Qisong replies:

> Yes. Although its meaning is transmitted separately outside the teachings, this matter must be indicated within the teachings. If it were not

[24] *Critical Essay*, 782c3–5.

> indicated within the Buddha's teachings, how is it possible to show that the Buddha has transmitted something other than his teachings? For this reason, the Tathāgata revealed this matter in his final words, saying that he had already transmitted the marvelous mind. Who says [the transmission of the marvelous mind] is not linked to the teachings? And so I quote the *Nirvāṇa* [*Sūtra*] to this effect.[25]

Qisong answers without hesitation that the transmission is indicated within texts and that therefore texts may be relied upon as evidence of it. If the transmission were not indicated within texts, how would those other than dharma heirs know that the Buddha had in fact transmitted the dharma? It is because the Buddha wanted the matter to be known that he made a final speech, recorded in the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra*, in which he explains that he had entrusted the dharma to Mahākāśyapa.[26] Qisong makes it clear that texts have the valuable function of communicating that the transmission exists.[27]

This means that absolute secrecy does not surround the transmission. The transmission itself can be spoken and written of, although "its meaning is transmitted separately outside the teachings." The indications of the transmission seem to take two forms; the first are references to the specific transmissions from the Buddha to Mahākāśyapa and so on for the first few generations, and the second are more subtle allusions to the existence and meaning of transmission, as found in the *Meditation Sūtra*. And the *Meditation Sūtra* is not the only place one may glimpse the "lineage gate":

> That which is called the mind is what is transmitted by all Chan patriarchs. Those of old called the dhyāna gate a lineage gate. It is also called 'our' lineage gate and the true inclination of the great principle of the teaching of the Buddha Śākyamuni. It is only that the meaning of the so-called lineage gate is scattered in many scriptures. It has been hidden and covered from antiquity up to now. It is not yet manifest, seen everywhere under Heaven.[28]

---

[25] *Critical Essay*, 782c5–9.
[26] T.12.375.617b17–28.
[27] This public/private dichotomy—and some of the reasons for it—appears also in the practice of dharma inheritance certificates, as discussed by Schlütter (*How Zen Became Zen*, 63–5). Although what passes between a master and his dharma heir is in one sense intimate, in the Song the fact of the master's recognition took the form of a document available for inspection by government officials.
[28] *Critical Essay*, 781a1–5.

Qisong suggests that these hidden clues to the transmission are visible only to those who are capable of understanding them. While he never states this explicitly, it seems that the two forms of indications thus correspond to two classes of people. The narrative of the first transmission is available to all, which is why Qisong appeals to it throughout the *Critical Essay*, especially when he is exasperated with those who deny the legitimacy of the transmission. Only those already advanced in understanding can pick up the allusions found in the *Meditation Sūtra* and "scattered in many scriptures," although Qisong, drawing on them for evidence, makes them more accessible.

Despite the relative obscurity surrounding the dharma transmission, Qisong presents it as the core of the Buddhist tradition, the realization transmitted within the lineage as the essence of the Buddha's teachings and the standard against which all teachings must be measured. (This feature of centrality and essentiality applies also to Chan in relation to the traditions of Buddhism.) In order to make this point, Qisong turns to accounts of how the Buddha instructed his followers to proceed after his parinirvāṇa.[29] He begins with the story in the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra* of the disciples of the Buddha asking him to remain in the world to teach them and the Buddha's response that he had entrusted the dharma to Mahākāśyapa who "will be for you and others a great support."[30] He follows this with a summary of a *Da zhidu lun* passage in which the Buddha, on the verge of death, tells Ānanda that after his parinirvāṇa, the monks ought to rely on the dharma, not others. Relying on the dharma is glossed as contemplating one's body and concentrating one's mind.[31] One is also to regard the vinaya and sūtras as one's teacher. Qisong then writes:

> The so-called "unsurpassed true dharma" [in the *Meditation Sūtra* verse quoted earlier] refers directly to the nature of the dharmas realized by the Tathāgata. [He] had already entrusted it to Mahākāśyapa. Those who want to study the dharma rely on this as the standard for rectifying themselves. Thus, in carrying out the chief dharma in later generations,

---

[29] The differences between these accounts were a point of controversy in the general debate over Chan lineage. Foulk discusses the issue in detail in "Sung Controversies Concerning the 'Separate Transmission' of Ch'an."

[30] Drawn from summary of the scene, T.12.375.617b17–28.

[31] T.25.1509.66c10.

> if he had not entrusted the seal of the dharma to uphold it, what would one take as chief?[32]

In this passage, we can see that Qisong does not consider the interdiction against relying on others to apply to Mahākāśyapa or the others who follow in the transmission. On the contrary, he equates Mahākāśyapa with the dharma. Mahākāśyapa was entrusted with the dharma before the Buddha's death and oversaw the collection of the dharma after the death of the Buddha. In the traditional understanding, these are two stages of a single process, accepting a responsibility and carrying it out, but Qisong bifurcates the meaning of dharma so that Mahākāśyapa was entrusted with the essence of the dharma and then also took charge of gathering the words the Buddha used to teach the dharma. Hence Qisong argues that the transmission provides someone whose understanding of the Buddha's teachings is absolutely reliable. To rely on a patriarch is to rely on the dharma, not on a person.

Texts, then, can alert us to the existence of a special group of people who embody the dharma. Can texts also express—as opposed to allude to—the special understanding or knowledge these people possess? Qisong marshals several sources to confirm that language is inadequate for the task of expressing the highest truth. He praises the Tiantai master Zhiyi as the "one who understood the teachings the most" and remarks, "Did he not say, 'The ultimate principle of the Buddhist teaching cannot be conveyed by words?'"[33] He also quotes the famous *Yuanjue jing* 圓覺經 analogy of the finger pointing at the moon.[34]

Concerning one of the most dramatic scriptural rejections of language, Qisong writes:

> A sūtra says that from Deer Park to the [Hiraṇya]vatī river, for fifty years, [the Buddha] did not speak one word. This is surely what is called

[32] *Critical Essay*, 779a18–22. This passage is difficult, and my translation is tentative.

[33] *Critical Essay*, 782b2–3. I have not found the source in Zhiyi's writings. Foulk sees a softening of anti-Tiantai argument in Qisong's quotation of Zhiyi ("Sung Controversies Concerning the 'Separate Transmission' of Ch'an," 261), whereas I see Qisong citing the great Tiantai figure defensively. It is difficult to argue against a position bolstered by the words of one's own master. This passage also occurs before a flurry of name-dropping at the end of the text, in which Qisong describes the many people and groups who allegedly respected Chan, including Song emperors, prominent non-Chan monks (Zhiyi, Zhanran, and several others) and famous lay patrons (Bei Xiu, Li Hua). Of course, many of the lines he quotes from them concern the importance of *chan*, or meditation, rather than Chan lineage or teaching.

[34] *Critical Essay*, 782b8–9 quoting T.17.842.917a27–8.

> "outside the teachings." However, this is the extreme of the mysterious and secret. Although it is recorded in sūtras, it is only explained. Because the sage realizes this, so [he] commands that the subtle teaching be transmitted by mind. This then is what Chan monks call the "separate transmission outside the teachings."[35]

Drawing on the rich tradition of Mahāyāna suspicion of language, Qisong confirms the rightness of the Chan tradition of transmission without language. He understands on some level that the patriarchs are competing for authority with texts. Although members of the early Tiantai tradition largely set the shift toward spiritual genealogy into motion in Chinese Buddhism, it was the Chan school that most successfully promoted it as a strategy of legitimation. When lineage exists in relationship with texts, as with Tiantai, the claim is of a special understanding of the texts passed down through generations.[36] The Chan school claimed something far more extreme, a transmission beyond spoken and written language.

In addition to gathering general scriptural support for the inadequacy of language, Qisong devotes a long interlinear note to the discrepancy between two manuscripts of the Huiyuan's preface to the *Meditation Sūtra*, one of which has Ānanda receiving *yinshao* 音韶, "oral teachings," and one of which has him receiving *zhizhao* 旨詔, the "principle of the teaching." He prefers the latter because "If one says 'yinshao,' how can the meaning be subtle?" To back up his choice, he cites a text by Zongmi (in which the line is not now to be found) and Huiguan's preface, which has Ānanda accepting *shengzhi* 聖旨, "sagely principle."[37]

Although Qisong believes the transmission between patriarch and heir occurs mentally, not orally, and quotes with approval the Laṅkāvatāra passage about the Buddha's lifelong silence, he is careful not to fixate on silence. When he rehearses Vimalakīrti's famous "seal of silence" and refers to Bodhidharma's praise of the silence of

---

[35] *Critical Essay*, 782b10–4. The quotation seems to be a paraphrase of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, which makes the same claim (T.16.670.498c18–9, 513a7–8; T.16.671.551b22–3 (referring to all Buddhas), 576b26–7; T.16.672.608b16–7; also the *Jin'guangming zuishengwang jing*, T.16.665.421c11–2.) Foulk translates the fourth and fifth lines of the quotation as "However, although these profound secrets are contained in the sūtras, they are still just talk" ("Sung Controversies Concerning the 'Separate Transmission' of Ch'an," 260–1).

[36] See Penkower, "In the Beginning."

[37] *Critical Essay*, 777c26–778a3. Here is another example of the need for texts to describe accurately the transmission beyond language.

his disciple Huike when asked to summarize what he has learned, he clarifies that it is not silence itself which is valued.[38]

> The subtlety and secrecy of this mind is truly inconceivable. It is neither words nor silence. It is comprehension that comprehension does not reach. It is knowledge at which knowledge does not arrive.[39]

In the end, what is the status of sūtras and other Buddhist literature? As examined in the previous section, Qisong defends vigorously the idea that Bodhidharma did preach and indeed compose the *Meditation Sūtra*. As he explains,

> As for the teaching of the twelve parts [i.e., Buddhist literature], the great sage responded skillfully to people's abilities to give the teaching and to lay a foundation. He used worldly names and words to uncover the truth in order to trigger people's awakenings. Therefore, the truth is marvelous and not what is taught. Although [he] spoke, in the end words do not reach the ultimate. As a result, the so-called "separate transmission outside the teachings" is not separate from the Buddha's teaching. It corrects that which the traces of his teachings do not reach.[40]

In this sense, the ultimate truth is both outside of and at the core of the teachings. It may be grasped only through the transmission, which completes what has been taught through language. The upāya of the teachings prepares people to understand. In this hierarchy, teachings are delivered through language until a wordless understanding emerges. The transmission is necessary because it provides the people who can prompt or pass on that understanding.

> [That which Huiyuan calls] "attainment beyond words, not discussed in the scriptures" unifies the one great teaching of our Śākyamuni Buddha: his sūtras, the vinaya, and the śāstras. None of those who study these do so without recourse to it, through which the utmost is reached.[41]

One studies the literary remains of the Buddha but relies on the transmission to succeed in understanding them. In discussing these points, Qisong resorts repeatedly to the classic Chinese distinction of essence and trace. He refers to the meaning of the transmission as the "dharma essence" and describes it as unconfined by words and yet present in the dharma treasury. He bemoans, for example, his contemporaries' inabil-

[38] *Critical Essay*, 781c2–16.
[39] *Critical Essay*, 782a1–3.
[40] *Critical Essay*, 782a25–9.
[41] *Critical Essay*, 778b1–4.

ity to grasp the essence of the Buddha's teachings in Bodhidharma's transmission.

> Alas, of the vinaya, meditation, and wisdom cultivated by the generation of bhikṣus today, what is not related to the teachings delivered by Śākyamuni? Of the sūtras, vinaya, and śāstras they are learning, which is not related to the eighty-four thousand dharma collections? However, they cling to the teachings transmitted by their teachers and defend what they have learned. They do not concern themselves with the dharma essence, and they do not carefully seek the true disposition of the great lineage. On the contrary, [they] neglect what was transmitted by the patriarch Bodhidharma. [They] say, "It does not compare to the path of our master." They not only violate the purpose of the Buddha but are also ignorant of the basis of the path. A pity, is it not?[42]

Even with authentic texts, Buddhists are lost without the dharma essence transmitted by the lineage. As Foulk writes,

> In Ch'i-sung's view, however, a true realization of that dharma always went beyond the words that conveyed it, and that 'going beyond' was the real meaning of the phrase, 'A separate transmission apart from the sūtras.' For him, the Ch'an lineage was distinguished not by its literal rejection of scriptures from the outset, but by its superior ability to penetrate to the very deepest meaning of the sūtras, a penetration that follows words as far as they can go and then, at the extreme limit of conceptualization, leaves them behind.[43]

This attitude is a moderate one and seems to reflect well the actual practice of Chan monks of the period, who most certainly did not abandon their textual studies, much less tear up their books. As Foulk notes, it also places Qisong in line with figures like Zongmi and Yanshou, who, in the debate over the relation between Chan and sūtras, emphasized the congruity of Chan teachings and the sūtras.[44] But Qisong's views are nevertheless more extreme that those of Zongmi, in large part because the rhetorical success of the Chan rejection of dharma had shifted the range of possible positions toward the more radical possibilities. Qisong's assertion that the lineage provides the standard stands in stark contrast to Zongmi's statement in the *Chan*

---

[42] *Critical Essay*, 781c8–14.
[43] "Sung Controversies Concerning the 'Separate Transmission' of Ch'an," 260.
[44] "Sung Controversies Concerning the 'Separate Transmission' of Ch'an," 260.

Preface that "[t]he sutras are like a [carpenter's] inked marking string, serving as a model by which to establish the false and the correct."[45]

Qisong's views of the role of language and texts may be clearer now, but many questions remain about the nature of the lineage to which the sūtras are secondary. In the following passage, Qisong expresses awe at the capacity of the lineage to advance the cause of Buddhism.

> Now all that which is shown by Chan [monks], no matter whether it is words, silence or action is the marvelous function of the first Buddha. It is only that we cannot see it. Although the source [for this assertion] exists, I spare myself trouble and do not disseminate it again. However, perhaps this is the intention of the sage. Only by being trusted to our secretly transmitted lineage can this wondrous function be uncovered and promoted. Why? It is because they fit each other well. Otherwise, how is it that from the patriarch Bodhidharma on, this trend has been flourishing so widely?[46]

Here, rather than emphasizing the rejection of language or sūtras, Qisong focuses on the true source of truth and authority: the members of the lineage, whose words, silence, and action express the realization of the Buddha. He also wonders at the way the secretly transmitted lineage and the "marvelous function of the first Buddha" suit each other. The Chan lineage, in other words, keeps to the essentials—the individuals who teach and transmit—and because it does not concern itself with sūtras and interpretations, it thrives. By this logic, the growth and success of the Chan school reflects directly the efficacy of its method of transmission.

The lines Qisong quotes most often from Huiyuan's preface are those which seem to describe Ānanda's behavior after receiving the transmission, and they offer a clue to Qisong's understanding of the nature of the lineage. In the following passage, the lines of Huiyuan that serve as Qisong's touchstones on the topic appear together.

> Until Huiyuan inherited from a disciple of Bodhidharma, it was transmitted secretly. Thus he wrote a preface to the *Meditation Sūtra*, saying, "Ānanda inherited the principle of the teaching completely. When encountering people who were not [fit to receive the teaching], [Ānanda] had to hide it in the numinous mansion [of his mind]." It also says, "Their attainments were beyond words, not discussed in the scriptures." It also says, "in the case of such a person, nothing is seen or heard of

[45] *Chan Preface*, T.48.2015.400b5, trans. Broughton, *Zongmi on Chan*, 108.
[46] *Critical Essay*, 781c14–9.

> him. It is clear that there is a separate teaching." In this way, how could what Huiyuan obtained be found within scriptures, teachings, language and words?[47]

Putting aside for now the reference to a secret transmission before Huiyuan, let us consider the appeal of Huiyuan's words for Qisong. According to Huiyuan, Ānanda and the others who succeeded to the lineage were themselves indescribable. They were also somehow beyond the knowledge of ordinary folks, moving invisibly through the world. This personal apartness is an aspect of the separateness of the transmission; the dharma heirs exist away from the ordinary, as well as outside teachings. The influence of the Chinese idea of the recluse and the Daoist idea of sage on Huiyuan's conception of Ānanda and his successors is strong, and Qisong seems to accept it.[48] But to understand Qisong's conception of the lineage and patriarchs, we must see them in action as they move through time.

Qisong's Vision of History

In the earlier sections of the *Critical Essay*, Qisong concerned himself with the provenance and vicissitudes of the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* in order to demonstrate its fallibility as an historical

---

[47] *Critical Essay*, 780c2–6.

[48] See Alan J. Berkowitz, *Patterns of Disengagement: The Practice and Portrayal of Reclusion in Early Medieval China*, esp. chap. 1. The influence of Chinese and particularly Daoist notions of sagehood also appears in an exchange about the necessity of the lineage:

> [The visitor] said, "With the teaching, I can attain awakening. What need is there to regard what is transmitted by this lineage as ultimate?"
>
> [I] said, "If you insist on being awakened to the way by means of the teaching, this is just seeing the doctrines, not seeing the way. The true seers of the way are those who probe to the root of things. One probes so that one can change; one changes so that one can understand. To be good at changing and understanding is to awaken to the way. Changing and then understanding it begin with our true lineage. If the sons of the Buddha can change and understand, then they participate in our true lineage." (*Critical Essay*, 782c20–5)

Qisong's response brings together, in language more typical of Daoist than Buddhist texts, the insistence of both traditions that real awakening is a matter of personal transformation, rather than the mastery of doctrines. His language also echoes that of Huiyuan in the preface: "Many follow the branch to seek the root, while a few know how to manipulate the tip by mastering the base. Some almost arrive but do not reach the destination. Some cling to their biases and do not know how to change"(T.55.2145.65c20–2). Unusually for Qisong, the lineage is not described here as exclusive but instead open to all who "probe to the root of things."

source. In this section, his efforts to establish the *Meditation Sūtra* as a credible source for Chan history necessitate a similar attention to origins and reception. But since he believes the *Meditation Sūtra*, unlike the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury*, to be an authentic product of Chan lineage, a narration of its history leads to more general comments on the history of Chan lineage, which he regards as central to the true history of Buddhism as a whole.[49]

While he does address specific historical problems like the identity of Bodhidharma and Dharmatrāta and the particulars of the first transmission, he also comments on the ebb and flow of time and its effect on the lineage.[50] His descriptions of the dharma transmission rely on a number of powerful theories of history, including a traditional Buddhist expectation of decline as one moves away from Śākyamuni, a particularly Chan faith in the continuity and timelessness of the lineage, and a Chinese understanding of fluctuations in moral standards. The last of these he inherits from Huiyuan, whose preface draws heavily on classical Chinese literature to describe Buddhist history and Buddhist masters.

While Qisong's belief that the lineage continues with its essence intact dominates, the other two models allow him to explain historical changes, especially differences in the receptivity of the world to the true lineage. He frequently adopts a teleological tone in discussion of the inevitability of events in the transmission of the dharma. However, he is still free to lament the mediocre historical understanding of his

---

[49] "Those of old called our Chan gate a lineage gate, but this is honoring the external characteristics of the traces of the teaching. However, this essence of Chan is the principle of our single Buddhist teaching, and the thirty-three patriarchs from Mahākāśyapa to Caoqi [Huineng] who transmitted the essentials of the dharma are all the patriarchs of the teaching of Śākyamuni. but those of shallow knowledge falsely separate Bodhidharma and Caoqi as merely the patriarchs of the Chan gate. Is this not also much mistaken?" (*Critical Essay*, 781b16–21)

Foulk discusses similar views on the part of Rujing (1163–1228) and his student Dōgen (1200–1253), which led to their criticism and rejection of the term *chanzong* ("Ch'an Myths," 154–6).

[50] I will not be addressing all these issues in detail, although they are of some interest. The first transmission causes some difficulty because Qisong must impose on the multiple scriptural statements about the Buddha's passing down his teachings the distinction between passing down teachings and transmitting mind-to-mind. He must also explain the relationship between the first two patriarchs, Mahākāśyapa and Ānanda, who were co-disciples rather than master and disciple. Interestingly, to resolve the latter issue, he refers to the need for siblings to inherit according to birth order.

predecessors and contemporaries in the Chan school and to disparage their willingness to proclaim themselves masters because these problems are indicative of a decline or fluctuation that does not affect the true transmission.

Qisong's views of the movement and nature of history will emerge in more detail as we examine his statements on the role and importance of the *Meditation Sūtra*, the question of when the lineage is disclosed publicly, secrecy surrounding the transmission, changes in the transmission, the changing activities and nature of patriarchs, and why Chan lineage proliferated into multiple lines in the generation after Huineng.

I argued earlier that Qisong's wish to see the *Meditation Sūtra* as more than a reliable source of historical data manifests itself in his attempt to prove that it contains allusions to the transmission of the dharma. The historical corollary is his argument that the text was significant in the introduction of the dharma transmission to China and in fact paved the way for Bodhidharma's arrival.

We might expect that Qisong sees the significance of the *Meditation Sūtra* in its veiled references to the transmission since he writes, "As for the saying 'not depending on words, pointing directly at the human mind, dealing directly with those of superior facilities,' the *Meditation Sūtra* already implies it, but it had not yet been uncovered."[51] In fact, he introduces another possibility. Discussing Huiguan, the student of Huiyuan who encountered Buddhabhadra in the capital, brought him back to Huiyuan's community at Mt. Lu, and composed an additional preface for the *Meditation Sūtra* (to which he referred by its alternate title *Bujingguan jing* [Sūtra on Contemplation of the Impure]), Qisong addresses once again the seemingly minor importance of the text. He writes:

> Thus by the time of Huiguan, it had already been more than three hundred and seventy years since the teaching of the Buddha had entered China. In what had been brought over, the magnificent sūtras and the great śāstras were now complete. How could [China] rely on one *Bujingguan jing* as its model? What he [Huiguan] said was [that China was] "without true practice to take as a model." It was precisely because China had not yet begun to truly possess the hidden dharma of ultimate realization that this [was] the model for those who studied teachings. How

[51] *Critical Essay*, 780b10–11.

can the *Meditation Sūtra* compare to the "magnificent sūtras and great śāstras"?[52]

Qisong asserts that in the absence of the "hidden dharma of ultimate realization," this insignificant text could offer a model of "true practice" that the loftiest works of Buddhist literature did not. Qisong rarely mentions meditation or any other religious practice, but we may assume that he is alluding to it here. The *Meditation Sūtra* thus prepared China for the Chan tradition by its focus on practice, but it was only a stopgap, a valuable but temporary measure.

Qisong, in what is now a familiar pattern of escalating statements, goes on to make a subtly magnified claim for the *Meditation Sūtra*. In the midst of deploring the ignorance of his contemporaries (or perhaps Chan historians as a whole), he suggests that it was not happenstance that the *Meditation Sūtra* was brought to China before a patriarch arrived in the flesh.

> Alas, since our scholarship is superficial, and few are knowledgeable, how could it be known that the ancient worthies first transmitted this *Meditation Sūtra* as advance preparation for the true line of Bodhidharma? In this we gain clear proof of the decline of our school.[53]

Qisong thus proposes a historical role for the *Meditation Sūtra*: it is a text meant to make way for a patriarch. Given his conviction that Bodhidharma composed the text and that Bodhidharma was a bodhisattva-monk using expedient means, it is easy to see the transmission of the *Meditation Sūtra* as a deliberate step in the turning of the dharma wheel. Qisong does not say explicitly that Bodhidharma sent Buddhabhadra to China for the purpose of transmitting the *Meditation Sūtra*, but that is the implication. He does not go into details about how this preparation worked. After all, only one person, Huike, understood Bodhidharma entirely. But perhaps Qisong is talking about

[52] *Critical Essay*, 778c8–12. In Huiguan's preface, T.55.2145.67a3–4.

[53] *Critical Essay*, 780c6–8. In translating this passage, I am drawing on Foulk's useful comments on the meanings of *zong* and in particular his use of 'lineage' and 'school' ("The Ch'an Tsung in Medieval China"). In an interlineal note in which he is attempting to account for a *Song gaoseng zhuan* reference, uncorroborated in other sources, to Bodhidharma's teacher Prajñātāra visiting China, Qisong muses, "If this sage suddenly came and went [from China], he must have come early by means of supranormal powers as advance preparation for Bodhidharma and the Chan lineage. If this is the case, it is a matter of a sage who cannot be fathomed" (*Critical Essay*, 778b19–20). In both cases, the term *zhangben* 張本 is used to mean "advance preparation."

the general atmosphere which allowed Huike to emerge and a small number of others to seek him as a teacher.

Also of great interest in this brief passage is the suggestion that the school is in decline. What does Qisong mean by this? It seems that he saw the true lineage as untouched by time and change, governed by its own principle, but unfolding in response to the surrounding community, which is subject to a cyclical pattern of improvement and decline. In this case, the *Meditation Sūtra* had little impact on China but still subtly prepared the ground for Bodhidharma. Bodhidharma's arrival in China led to the popular success of Huineng and his dharma heirs, but soon afterwards superficial scholarship set in. This pattern accommodates the common Song notion of the Tang as a golden age of Chan—a view that scholars have argued convincingly was created retroactively by Song texts—without sacrificing the legitimacy and potency of the true lineage in Qisong's own time. [54] Hence, Qisong and his dharma-brothers are heir to an undiminished transmission but live in a world less able to recognize their authenticity and absorb their teachings.

Qisong's understanding of secrecy also turns on such changes in the world. As noted earlier in connection to textual references to the transmission, the transmission is neither discussed openly nor hidden entirely. But in the case of living, breathing patriarchs as opposed to texts, oscillations in receptivity of the surrounding society affect not only the degree to which the lineage is understood but the degree to which it is concealed or disclosed. One might think that the obtuseness of ordinary people is sufficient to shield the lineage from unwanted attention, but in fact Qisong describes deliberate secrecy on the part of members of the lineage. He quotes more than once from Huiyuan's evocative description of Ānanda:

> When encountering people who were [not fit to receive the teaching], [Ānanda] had to hide it in his mind. Why? Because the mind has no regulation; its changes are many. The subjects of numbers are not fixed; they respond to circumstance. For this reason, when [Ānanda] was preaching in India, [he] had [his teaching] sealed by a craftsman [i.e., to avoid transmitting at the wrong time]. The dark gate was not opened, and rarely was the courtyard glimpsed. From this it can be observed

[54] On the golden age notion, see Gregory, "The Vitality of Buddhism in the Sung," esp. 2–4.

> that the principle is sometimes used and sometimes hidden, and the way should not be bestowed in vain.[55]

Kimura Eiichi notes references to a wide range of classical Chinese literature in this passage: *Zhuangzi*, the *Analects*, the *Yijing*, and the *Liji*.[56] Huiyuan borrows this potent language to make the important point that Ānanda had to conceal the truth from those unready for it. The idea that a Buddhist teacher should not offer a teaching to one incapable of understanding it is an ancient one. The dharma is not to be squandered or distorted. That the same teaching can sometimes act as a medicine and sometimes as a poison is also an old one (and deeply meaningful to Qisong).[57]

Introducing the first line of the above passage, Qisong writes that "Until Huiyuan inherited from a disciple of Bodhidharma, it was transmitted secretly."[58] He seems to be saying that the transmission itself was a secret until Huiyuan wrote of it. But Huiyuan did not write openly of it either. As Qisong understands it,

> At the time of Huiyuan, Bodhidharma had not yet come. The people of China had not yet begun to hear even a little about the story of the secret transmission of the ultimate realization [i.e., awakening]. Although Huiyuan had obtained it himself, to make it known immediately would shock the assembly and give rise to slander. And so he gathered that he could not do this alone. When the scripture came out, he then explicated it [in his preface]. Yet what he says is most obscure and at time not related to the words of the scripture. The meaning was in the hidden essence of the scripture. It is not proper to seek it amidst the trifling thirty thousand-odd words [of the scripture]. For example, [the preface] says, "Ānanda received the principle of the teaching completely," but this is not included in the scripture. And [the preface] first names Mahākāśyapa. This must be out of a special desire to clarify that Ānanda transmitted outside the teaching of the scriptures of the Buddha and separately received this profound principle. If it is not so, how could it be different from the scripture?[59]

In other words, Huiyuan's preface to the *Meditation Sūtra* mimics the *Meditation Sūtra* itself by alluding to the transmission without reveal-

---

[55] *Critical Essay*, 778a3–6. Original preface at T.15.618.301a3–7 and T.55.2145. 65c5–9.

[56] *Eon kenkyū*, 449.

[57] See *Critical Essay*, 779b15–22.

[58] *Critical Essay*, 780c2.

[59] *Critical Essay*, 778b21–c1.

ing it. As for the meaning submerged in the *Meditation Sūtra*, Huiyuan brought it out a little, but it could still be seen only by some.

One wonders what slander could arise from the revelation of the transmission. In the absence of a patriarch, knowledge of the patriarchs was perhaps dangerous. (This problem does not, of course, arise in relation to the *Transmission of the Dharma Treasury* because it reported on a lineage that did not continue into the present.) Qisong reasons that Huiyuan hid the truth so that only some would perceive it. The preface thus serves as preparation, just as the *Meditation Sūtra* itself. Qisong even compliments Huiyuan for having improved on the sūtra: "The reason this preface is vast, marvelous, and secret like this is perhaps because [Huiyuan] succeeded in clarifying the ideas of the author of the scripture. Such is the meticulousness of those who knew our true lineage."[60]

Because knowledge of the transmission is dangerous to those unprepared for it, Ānanda and his successors kept it secret. Qisong does not discuss directly the fact that by his own time, knowledge of the lineage was widespread, but it is likely part and parcel of the pattern—that he implies elsewhere—of unreadiness before Bodhidharma, flourishing during the Tang, and outward decline in his own time. Thus, Qisong must warn those who dare dispute the legitimacy of Chan lineage that they are exposing their own ignorance, harming the dharma, and harming themselves. As he puts it, "However, the true lineage is most subtle and most secret. It can be seen only by those with 'true eyes of the way.' If one tries to understand it with his own ideas and debates fiercely, the more he engages in debate, the farther he will deviate from the truth."[61] This encapsulates his view of the secrecy that even a thriving Chan school that celebrates its patriarchs does not disperse. It is secret by virtue of its subtlety, and anyone who tries to penetrate it with intellect and partisanship is bound to fail.

Along with the shift from a secret transmission to public knowledge of it, Qisong must account for another dramatic change in the pattern of the transmission: the decision of patriarchs to abandon sūtra study in favor of the mind-to-mind transmission only. To understand how Qisong understood this change, we need first to explore Qisong's conception of the patriarch. He adopts Huiyuan's vision of Buddhist

[60] *Critical Essay*, 778b8–10.
[61] *Critical Essay*, 782b27–9.

leaders who in the few generations after the Buddha were "in line" with him. They had his knowledge and attainments and passed them on only to those who were fit, thus guarding the tradition.[62] They also displayed the ability to adapt to circumstances. Qisong quotes from Huiyuan's preface:

> Investigating the intention of the sage, [we find that] he wants not only to establish the advanced but also wanted to aid the slow. If this is done, the different practices of the five schools will be preserved by suitable people. Because such suitable people do not appear in each successive generation, the path sometimes flourishes and sometimes declines. There are times of neglect and rejuvenation that alternately ascend and descend. How could the category of great and small be fixed? Moreover, he understands crises well and is good at adapting to the changes of the world. Obscuring his name and covering his tracks, nothing is heard of him, and he does not give instruction. In the case of such a person, it is not possible to identify by name or school. He is not one who [can be] distinguished by name or school, nor does he go beyond them. It is clear that it is a separate teaching.[63]

This description closely resembles that of the traditional Chinese sage, who at times is not known and during times of decline goes into hiding. Both the recluse and the sage adapt to circumstances so as to protect themselves. Bodhisattvas also adapt as needed in order to teach effectively. The patriarch, as Qisong presents him, does both. To Qisong, the passage describes patriarchs who preserve the lineage and reveal it more widely only when the world is ready for his teaching. The flexibility in teaching required by upāya expands to include flexibility in facing the supply or lack of advanced students. Being "separate from teaching" means an ability to disappear, to withdraw from the world of teaching that continues in the temples no matter the quality of the teachers and students. The essence is preserved in the form of the lineage, no matter the state of the traces or outward activity.

According to Qisong, these qualities of adaptability came into play when patriarchs adjusted their teaching to their students.

> [The visitor] said, "If that is so, then the *Meditation Sūtra* lists from the beginning the patriarchs who transmitted the dharma. How could all the patriarchs of old have also transmitted the scriptures and teachings?"

---

[62] See *Critical Essay*, 778a9–10.
[63] *Critical Essay*, 778a19–24.

> [I] said, "That is correct. In the past, the dharma was transmitted in order to verify the practice and teachings. Thus, those who enter the path through teachings must regard what the patriarchs transmit as the seal of truth. The *Chan Preface* [of Zongmi] says that the patriarchs who transmitted the dharma at first practiced [it] equally with the vehicle of teaching from the tripiṭika. The patriarchs of later generations observed [people's varying] facilities and made a special effort to promote the lineage and eliminate attachment. They then further transmitted the mind seal alone."[64]

With "dharma" signifying the content of the transmission, Qisong explains that in the beginning, this "dharma" served as a seal of truth. The approval of a patriarch "sealed" the realization of a disciple who entered the path through study. In time, however, patriarchs saw the opportunity to eliminate attachment (to teaching, presumably) and chose to omit teachings and transmit the mind seal alone.

To support this description, Qisong refers to Zongmi's *Chan Preface*. Qisong selectively summarizes and quotes from a passage in which Zongmi is arguing that sūtras and Chan cannot conflict because "[t]he mouth and mind of the buddhas cannot possibly be contradictory."[65] To reconcile the seeming conflict of Chan and sūtra study, Zongmi explains that early in the transmission, the patriarchs were "equally versed in all three baskets," a line Qisong reformulates to mean that the patriarchs balanced the transmission of the dharma with study of the tripiṭika. Zongmi then describes the commentarial work of the patriarchs Aśvaghoṣa and Nāgārjuna as an example of Chan and exegesis coexisting peacefully. Next he explains that Bodhidharma initiated mind-to-mind transmission because he saw that most Chinese Buddhist scholars did not yet know Mahāyāna meditation. Broughton translates:

> Because his desire was to inform them that the moon does not lie in the finger [pointing at the moon] and that dharma *is* our mind, he just [raised the slogan] "a mind-to-mind transmission; no involvement with the written world." To reveal his [mind] axiom and eradicate grasping he had this saying. It is not that he was preaching a liberation [consisting] of freedom from the written word.[66]

---

[64] *Critical Essay*, 780a16–21.

[65] T.48.2015.400b11, Broughton's translation, *Zongmi on Chan*, 109.

[66] T.48.2015.400b19–21, translated in *Zongmi on Chan*, 109–10. Foulk also translates the passage ("Sung Controversies Concerning the 'Separate Transmission' of Ch'an," 234).

In summarizing Zongmi's statement, Qisong does not name Bodhidharma, referring simply to "patriarchs of later generations," and uses the same four-character line *xianzong pozhi* 顯宗破執 in a way that makes more likely a different reading: "manifest the lineage (or principle) and eliminate attachment." And unlike Zongmi who then points out that those who succeeded Bodhidharma frequently praised the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and *Vajracchedikā Sūtra* (and that "it is precisely mind and buddha that are the basic ideas of the sutras and treatises"),[67] Qisong concludes by emphasizing that the mind seal alone was transmitted. He does see a place for the sūtras, but it is decidedly secondary.

The Branching of the Lineage

In another exchange, Qisong addresses what appears to be another momentous change, the proliferation of Chan lineage among Huineng's students. When groups of Buddhists began in the early Tang to make claims of connection to Bodhidharma, they were looking backward in order to legitimize their masters. The logic of religious genealogy soon intruded on the present, as students vied for recognition by their masters as dharma heirs in the newly conceived lineage. As a result, the lineage sprouts multiple lines almost as soon as it is put forward as a justification for authority. The ostensible end of the single line prompts the following question.

> [The visitor] said, "You say that it must be that the mind seal was passed down generation to generation to be proof of the true seal forever. How is it that the transmission of old arrived at Caoqi [Huineng] and then the patriarchate was cut off?"
>
> [I] said, "How could the patriarchate be cut off as a result? It is only that from the time the true lineage entered China to the time it reached Caoqi, it had already been a long while. People practiced and knew this dharma very well. There were many of talent and accomplishment. The true lineage could thus be transmitted widely. Though its branches and roots were increasingly divided, they were successively passed down, each with its own patriarchs. With dharma, they identified with each other generation after generation. When did it ever cease to be a school? It is like the clans of the common folk taking names for their families

[67] *Chan Preface* 400b19–21. Translated by Broughton, *Zongmi on Chan*, 110.

> so that sons and grandsons continue offerings to ancestors. It is only that this transmitted dharma, while there are branch patriarchs, does not compare to the flourishing of the true patriarchs."[68]

Qisong explains that although it may appear that the one-to-one transmission has disappeared, it is merely obscured by the multitude of collateral lines that are a sign of great success. He does not, however, state clearly which line is primary and which collateral. Indeed, in a note in the *Record*, he provides the first surviving description of the five 'families' or 'houses' of Chan, and states forcefully that while some may be ascendant and others weak, "the prosperity and decline of the different traditions has nothing to do with the strength and weakness of their dharma. It seems to be a question of whether they can get people in the transmission to the next generation."[69]

Qisong provides a slightly different angle on this large and flourishing 'clan' of Chan practitioners when answering a question about the iconoclastic behavior of some members of the Chan tradition.

> When the patriarch entered China with the true lineage, among the scholastic monks, some put aside their inclination to strive and compete. Among the learners of Buddhism, some [were taught] to point directly at their minds and were thus spared the labor of exegesis. Among the learners of Buddhism, some who achieved awakening elsewhere had their understanding verified by Chan masters. There were those who exclusively by means of the true lineage attained the joy of dharma. In more than five hundred years, such people are surely innumerable. The Tathāgata left for later generations the verification of the true seal. Is it not apparent? It is wonderful that the merit of the patriarchs spread in the world.[70]

This curious typology of Chinese Buddhists who have benefited from the patriarchs affirms, first of all, the success of Bodhidharma and his successors. It also confirms that the lineage is the source of authority, for those who attained awakening through other means go to Chan masters for verification.

---

[68] *Critical Essay*, 782c11–21, correcting the Taishō's *zhengdan* 正旦 to *zhendan* 震旦, as in the Palace edition.

[69] T.51.763c9–10. Translation by Schlütter, who provides the whole passage in a discussion of the emergence of a scheme of distinct Chan lineages (*How Zen Became Zen*, 22–24).

[70] *Critical Essay*, 782b21–7.

Conclusion

In the second fascicle of the *Critical Essay*, Qisong takes us past arguments over sources into substantial discussion of the very nature of Chan lineage. He delves into the relation of the mind-to-mind transmission to the outward teachings of the Buddha, the secrecy often surrounding dharma transmission, the history of the 'separate' dharma transmission as the inner or secret history of the Buddhism, and the branching of the lineage into more than one line after Huineng.

He also alternates between celebrating the lineage and deploring the current state of the school based upon it. In one passage describing his contemporaries, we glimpse how Qisong saw his own role:

> Nowadays, despite the decline of the lineage gate, there are many self-proclaimed, unqualified "Chan masters." The qualified masters are really rare. Scholars who are knowledgeable must respect and follow the sage intentions of late buddhas. How could they take pleasure in the decline of Chan, take advantage of its lack of good masters, ignore the great lineage and great patriarchs, and profane the substance of the dharma-gate? Can this be called knowledge? A worldly book [the *Analects*] says, "[Confucius said], 'Ci! You regret the loss of the lamb, whereas I regret the loss of the rite.'" This is also not forgetting the way of these sages.[71]

In referring to the *Analects*, Qisong likens himself to Confucius, who, knowing and valuing the ways of the past, refused to alter tradition. He also draws on a pattern of history well-known to all educated Chinese, especially in relation to Confucius, according to which the golden age is past, and the only proper response is to resist change and to preserve what remains of that golden age.

Qisong's historical work reflects this conservatism as well as a form of moderation that keeps him, even rhetorically, well within the Buddhist tradition as a whole. He places Chan at the core of Buddhism, rather than beyond it. He accepts the most radical Chan claims, like the rejection of sūtras, and yet blunts their edges with interpretations that puts them back into a larger Buddhist context.

In an infusion of Chinese tradition particularly interesting in a monk who greatly appreciated Confucian teachings, he depicts the patriarchs as sage-like in their preservation of their 'inheritance' from the Bud-

[71] *Critical Essay*, 783b21–6. The line quoted is *Analects* 3.17, translated by Slingerland, 24, but retaining the form of disciple's name actually used in the passage.

dha and in their adaptation to changes in circumstance. In developing a theory flexible enough to account for all the inconsistencies of a jumble of sources, he also draws on Chinese tradition to expand the repertoire of theories of history available to him. He combines them to present a lineage that survives undiminished and is ready to blossom or withdraw depending on the receptivity of society.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

I came to this project with a persistent curiosity about religious authority. Long before I encountered the academic study of religion, I was fascinated not only by the beliefs and practices of the religious people around me but also by the question of why they believed and behaved as they did. I often found myself querying religious people about how they understood and justified their traditions and why they gave religion such power in their lives. This study, in a sense, is simply an extension of such questions into the field of Chan Buddhism. It also represents the intersection of two trajectories: that of the centuries-long development of the innovative notion of religious lineage and that of the life of Qisong.

Given that the historicity of Chan lineage claims began to be eviscerated by religious rivals many centuries ago and by scholars some decades ago, some scholars of Chinese Buddhism have tended to regard lineage as a closed book, as something to move past on the way to topics more worthy of study. I have tried instead to regard lineage narratives as historically faulty but religiously important and to move not past them but through them to a better comprehension of Chan and of East Asian Buddhism more broadly. Thus I have attempted both to analyze Qisong's defense and understanding of lineage on their own terms and to reconstruct the social, political, and historical context of Qisong and his writings on lineage.

Chan lineage has long been associated with the rejection of sūtras and other forms of traditional Indian Buddhist literature. I hope to have complicated the picture somewhat by showing as I do in Chapter One that the process by which lineage emerged was not a simple and automatic rejection of commentarial literature and then sūtras in favor of patriarchs. Rather, the notion of lineage arose in fits and starts as a supplement to or even justification of the transmission of texts and textual knowledge.

Robert Sharf has forwarded the argument that "Ch'an, for one, was founded on an ideology that rationalized the selective rejection of Indian authority."[1] While I do not disagree with this analysis, I add to

[1] *Coming to Terms with Chinese Buddhism*, 24.

it in Chapter Two by exploring how lineage, while effectively bypassing traditional forms of Indian Buddhist authority, takes the form of claiming transmission from Indian figures. In other words, lineage, for all that it is largely a Chinese Buddhist innovation, represents Chinese Buddhist recognition for authority derived from India.

In addition, lineage may very well be a significant part of the Chinese response to the fundamental Buddhist dilemma of the absence of the Buddha and the decline of the dharma. John Strong has written that "all the masters of the Dharma are . . . intractably caught up in this tension. As transmitters of the Buddha's Doctrine, they are intimately involved in both its loss and its preservation. As forest saints and meditators, they are witnesses to both the present possibility of enlightenment and to its postponement until the time of Maitreya."[2] Can it be any surprise that Chan Buddhists, like many Chinese Buddhists highly conscious of their remoteness from the Buddha, would pick up on this tension and elaborate on it through dharma transmission? Indeed, Chan patriarchs may be seen as both a response to anxiety about the decline of the dharma and the emphatic response of some Chinese Buddhists that the dharma has been preserved and enlightenment is possible.

By looking more deeply into the details of Qisong's life than has been done previously, in Chapter Three, I challenge certain assumptions about him as unfounded, particularly the view of him as a sort of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, a mild-mannered 'Confucian monk' by day and a history-distorting sectarian zealot by night. By attending closely to Qisong's own language, we can see that he regarded all of his activities as the promotion and defense of true religion. Nor, as I argue in Chapter Four, was his great success in securing the acceptance of his works into the imperial canon necessarily a result of his work on the compatibility of the Confucian and Buddhist traditions. The imperial court responded specifically to Qisong's appeal to the need for clear succession. The study of Qisong's life in these chapters also yields a wealth of detail about how he and others navigated the straits of intra-Buddhist conflict in a world of elite monks and high officials as well as a good corrective to the model of the spontaneous, iconoclastic Chan master found in classic Chan literature and still taken as fact in too much scholarship.

[2] *The Legend and Cult of Upagupta*, 74.

A close reading of Qisong's historiographical work, the *Critical Essay on the True Lineage of the Transmission of the Dharma*, in Chapter Five yielded a number of insights. I argue that we must look past critiques of Qisong's historical accuracy or honesty to draw out the assumptions guiding his creative reconstruction of Chan lineage from a wide range of sources.

Thomas Wilson, writing of lineage discourse in the Confucian revival of the Song points out that "[g]enealogy was not an idea, a concept, or a doctrine that was formally invented and explicated as an issue in itself."[3] Nor had it been in the Chan school, but with Qisong, lineage does become a direct object of extended discussion, and in Chapter Six, I presented his understanding of lineage as the core of the Buddhist tradition. I also confirm T. Griffith Foulk's analysis of Qisong's place on the 'conservative' side of the range of views of the dharma transmission.[4] I further explicate the vision of Buddhist history that emerges when Qisong explains the nature and meaning of Chan lineage.

Ultimately, the juxtaposition of the development of lineage within the Chan tradition with the life of Qisong has, for me, forced a renewed appreciation for the axiom, too often forgotten, that there is no Buddhism, only Buddhists. And thus Qisong, writing and rewriting in response to his contemporaries' criticisms of Buddhism and of Chan lineage, drew on a motley assortment of sources to create a sweeping vision of the history of Buddhism with Chan dharma transmission at its core. In so doing, he lays bare for us the assumptions, truths, and power of the tradition shaping him and being shaped by him.

---

[3] *Genealogy of the Way*, 77.

[4] "Sung Controversies Concerning the 'Separate Transmission' of Ch'an."

APPENDIX

ANNOTATED TRANSLATION OF THE *CRITICAL ESSAY* BY THE SONG ŚRAMAṆA SHI QISONG OF DONGSHAN [SI] 東山[寺] IN TENGZHOU 藤州 T.51.2080.773C–783C[1]

Fascicle One

Part One

Since the Sui and Tang, the lineage of Bodhidharma 達磨 has been promoted greatly, but scholastics have doubts about it. Many of them use the *Fu fazang zhuan* 付法藏傳 [Account of the Transmission of the Dharma Treasury] to raise questions. They say that this history lists only twenty-four generations up to the patriarch Siṃha 師子 and then ends. [They say that] what Bodhidharma inherited does not truly descend from the honored one Siṃha [and that] the so-called [Chan lineage of] twenty-eight [Indian] patriarchs is thus a deceptive story of later men. Chan [monks] sometimes quote the *Baolin zhuan* 寶林傳 [Record of Baolin [Temple]] to substantiate [this tradition], but the *Baolin zhuan* is also a Chan book. Accordingly, critics are scarcely inclined to accept it. With all this noisy squabbling, for generations there has been no way to set the matter straight. [773c10]

I was disquieted by this, and therefore I investigated the two [differing] accounts [of Indian patriarchs], wanting, with all humility, to determine the truth. In examining the so-called *Fu fazang zhuan*, [I find that] it was done in the Later Wei 後魏 (386–535). It appeared after the destruction of Buddhism in the [Taiping] Zhenjun [太平]真君 era (440–452), translated by the Indian monk Kiṅkara 吉迦夜.[2]

[1] In the following, italics indicate not only titles but also interlineal notes. Since these notes were written by Qisong himself, I have chosen not to relegate them to footnotes but to keep them in the text, identified by italics. Note also that the names of patriarchs are according to Yampolsky's Sanskrit reconstructions (*The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*, 8–9) unless otherwise noted.

[2] Sanskrit reconstruction following Mochizuki 1:525. Hirakawa gives Kiṃkārya (*Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary*, 240), and Charles Willemen renders as Kikkāya (*The Storehouse of Sundry Valuables* 1–2).

I inspected the items in each of the accounts and [found] that there was some order to the generations of patriarchs. In examining the text, however, [I found that] the transmissions from masters to disciples, the countries from which they came, their surnames, and their clans were extremely muddled. Whatever is more detailed has been plucked from all the sections of the tripiṭaka and is not original [to this text]. Ordinarily, if one wishes to write a book describing a person and the generations before and after [him], he must verify the lineage from ancestors and father down to sons. Furthermore, the family name, clan, and place of the person as well as how his activities came about must be presented without the omission of the smallest detail so that later generations place their faith in it. Only then may it be called an historical account. [773c18]

Now although this book is called an "account," these matters are always undetailed. For example, when it narrates the lives of the seven patriarchs Miccaka 彌遮迦多, Buddhanandi 佛陀難提, and the Elder Biluo 比羅長老 down to Vasubandhu 婆修槃陀, Manorhita 摩拏羅, Haklenayaśas 鶴勒那夜奢, and the arhat Siṃha, there is no mention of personal transmissions from master to disciple.[3] As for the three patriarchs Buddhanandi, Haklenayaśas, and Siṃha, they are the most lacking in the description of predecessors. We do not see from whom they received [the transmission], and [in describing] the later generations to whom it was entrusted, the text says only, "…next transmitted to…next there was…there was also a certain bhikṣu" and so forth. If, in the end, the transmission is neither clearly nor completely recounted, how is this adequate as an historical account? How could it appear credible to later generations? [773c26]

[The *Fu fazang zhuan*] tells of the bhikṣu Siṃha, saying that the king of Kashmir had false views and because of this beheaded Siṃha with a sharp sword. From his head flowed no blood, only milk. The men who transmitted the dharma were, with this, cut off.[4] I say this story really cannot be true. Let me attempt to comment on it. For instance, in the account of Mahākāśyapa, it says, "When the Buddha was about to pass into extinction, he said to Mahākāśyapa, 'I am going to enter nirvāṇa. I entrust to you this profound dharma. In the future, you

[3] A number of scholars have taken Elder Biluo to be Kapimala 迦比摩羅, but Maspero, seconded by Young, questions this and proposes Vīra instead (Maspero 141; Young 120).

[4] Condenses the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan*, T. 2058.321c15–18.

should honor and follow my intention. Broadly propagate and spread [the dharma]; do not allow it to be cut off.'"[5] How then could those of later generations who inherited [the dharma] from the Buddha and became patriarchs allow this dharma to be cut off? [774a6]

Furthermore, in narrating the life of Upagupta 掬多堀, it says that he wanted to enter nirvāṇa, but as Dhītika 提多迦 had not yet been born, he waited especially until his birth to pass on the dharma and only then "was transformed" [i.e., died].[6] The account of Kāṇadeva 迦那提婆 says that he conquered false ways with the dharma and then was harmed by the disciples of the false path. Kāṇadeva, while enduring death, explained [his suffering] as karmic retribution, transmitted the dharma to Rāhula 羅睺羅, and then died.[7] Now if Siṃha was a patriarch like Upagupta and Kāṇadeva, how could he alone die without seeing to [the transmission of] the dharma? In the matter of succeeding the Tathāgata as a great patriarch who appears in the world, if one is not a sage, he cannot take part. Siṃha took part, so he must have been a sage. How could there be a sage who did not know he would die in karmic retribution? Knowing of his death, how could he not foresee his fate and properly transmit this dharma, making it continue endlessly to the teachers and masters of later generations? If the conditions for the successive transmission of the dharma stopped at this sage, he should have known of it in advance and announced its end. If he did not know of his death and thus failed to transmit [the dharma] and failed to announce [the end of the transmission of the dharma], how is he be worthy to be placed in the list of the patriarchs and given a biography? In writing a biography for such a person, one should consider carefully. If the Indian manuscript was originally written like this, its credibility must be questioned. [The translator] ought to have left these lacunae there to [be resolved] by those to come. How could he so heedlessly pen such a story, giving rise to disputes in later generations at the expense of the sages of old? How can one not be frightened by this? [774a20]

The *[Jingde] chuandeng lu* 景德傳燈錄 [Jingde Record of the Transmission of the Lamp] says:

---

[5] Condenses T. 2058.297b6, 12–13.

[6] Summarizes T. 2058.313b14–15. Dhītika has also been reconstructed as Dhṛṭaka.

[7] Summarizes T. 2058.318c22–23. For the reconstruction Rāhula, I am following Maspero (142), rather than Yampolsky. See Young's helpful discussion (136).

Formerly in the Tang, the administrator of Henan, Li Chang 李常, obtained the śarīra of the third patriarch Sengcan 僧璨. One day he fed śramaṇas [to celebrate] enshrining it. He then asked a Tripiṭaka master from the western regions named Jianna 犍那, "How many Chan patriarchs were there in India?"[8] Jianna said, "From Mahākāśyapa to Prajñātāra 般若多羅, there were twenty-seven patriarchs. If we speak of the collateral line of the honored one Siṃha, the four generations from Damoda 達磨達 is in itself twenty-two men.[9] Altogether there are forty-nine patriarchs. If [we count] from the seven Buddhas to this great master Sengcan, not including offshoots, there are thirty-seven generations."

Li Chang again asked the elder monks in attendance, "I once inspected the patriarch charts. Some refer to more than fifty patriarchs, to the point that the branches are mixed up and lineages are not fixed. Some are nothing more than empty names. How is one to verify any of this?" There happened to be present a disciple of the sixth patriarch called Chan Master Zhiben 智本 who replied, "This is because of the persecution of Buddhists in the Later Wei [386–535]. At that time there was a monk named Tanyao 曇曜, who, in a great hurry, made a simple record of the names of all the patriarchs. He kept it when he fled to the mountains and wild fields. By the time Emperor Wencheng 文成 [r. 452–465] restored the [Buddhist] teaching, all told thirty years had passed. In the time of Emperor Xiaowen 孝文 [r. 471–499], Tanyao advanced to [the position of] Superintendent of Monks 僧統, and he released what he had recorded.[10] Some monks used it to write a book, entitling it *Fu fazang zhuan* 付法藏傳 [Account of the Transmission of the Dharma]. *The* Account of the Transmission of the Dharma *is also said to have been written by Tanyao*. It had lacunae and errors; it was incomplete. It is probably because of Tanyao's flight that it was like this.[11] [774b5]

As I pointed out before, [the *Fu fazang zhuan*] is not complete. By examining Zhiben's story, we see that [the *Fu fazang zhuan* is] indeed a book made by collecting material that is incomplete and excluded [from the canon]. Moreover, its section title says, "So-and-so entrusted

---

[8] It is also possible to read this name as Qianna, as Jinhua Jia does (86).

[9] According to the *Baolin zhuan*, Damodo was a collateral disciple of Siṃha (Tanaka Ryōshō 田中良昭, *Hōrinden yakuchū*, 285–88, 299–301). Yanagida, *Shoki zenshū*, 374, offers a helpful chart of the *Baolin zhuan*'s account of the collateral line that begins with Damoda.

[10] These dates do not accord with what we know of this period. According to the *Wei shu Shi-Lao zhi* 魏書釋老志 it was early in the period 460–466 that Tanyao became Superintendent of Monks (Tsukamoto, "The Sramana Superintendent T'anyao and His Time," 379).

[11] T.51.222a3–27. Translated in Ogata, *The Transmission of the Lamp,* 81–83. Since the extant text attributed to Tanyao provides only 24 names, it is unclear how referring to him resolves the problem Li is raising, i.e., that of too many patriarchs.

such-and-such."[12] Surely this simple record is not an original, complete text. [774b9]

In the *Baolin zhuan*, although the words are common and coarse, the narration tiresome and confusing, and it cannot be classified as a scholarly work, the events it describes still have a beginning and end. There is also justification for the number of generations and the names. While I would like to use [the *Baolin zhuan*], when I look into its sources, [I see that] sometimes it refers to secular books that are not extant. It refers to Buddhist works that do not appear in the catalogues of the canon. Although there are some parts that accord with what is in the canon, and it is not the work of another lineage,[13] I have always suspected that it was baseless, and so I did not dare to discuss it. [774b14]

Formerly, in a library in Nanping 南屏, I happened to obtain an old book called the *Chu sanzang ji[ji]* 出三藏記[集] [Collection of Notes on the Translation of the Tripiṭaka].[14] It has fifteen fascicles and was written by the eminent Liang monk Sengyou 僧祐. [There is] a part called "Record of the Table of Contents of the Account of the Transmission of the Sarvāstivāda School" 薩婆多部相承傳目錄.[15] Sengyou's own preface says, in the beginning, "Only the Sarvāstivāda School circulated everywhere in China. It originally arose in India and spread to Kashmir. The sages and worthies of earlier and later generations shine more brilliantly together."[16] From Mahākāśyapa 大迦葉 to Dharmatrāta 達磨多羅, it spans two fascicles and contains in total more than a hundred names. [774b20]

Let us investigate it. The text refers to someone called Poluoduoluo 婆羅多羅. This is the same as another name for the twenty-fifth patriarch, Basiasita [Poshesiduo] 婆舍斯多.[17] *For its meaning, see his biography.* The text refers to someone called Furuomiduo 弗若蜜多. This is the same as another name for the twenty-sixth [patriarch], Puṇyamitra

[12] No section titles in the Taishō text.
[13] Qisong here uses the term *zong* 宗 to refer other groups or traditions within Chinese Buddhism.
[14] He most likely refers to the monastery on Mt. Nanping, southwest of Hangzhou.
[15] T.2145.88c29. The text itself is not extant, but Sengyou provides a table of contents.
[16] T.2145.89a3–5.
[17] Number 50 in the *Chu sanzang ji ji*.

[Burumiduo] 不如蜜多.[18] The text refers to Buruoduoluo 不若多羅.[19] This is the same as another name for the twenty-seventh [patriarch], Panreduoluo [Prajñātāra] 般若多羅.[20] The text refers to someone called Damoduoluo [Dharmatrāta] 達磨多羅 who was the twenty-eighth [patriarch]. [The name] Putidamo [Bodhidharma] 菩提達磨 combines his dharma and lay names. *For its meaning, see his biography.* The other patriarchs are the same. [774b26]

If one is called Upagupta 掬多堀, sometimes the first character is the same and the second different, and sometimes the first character is different and the second character the same. Sometimes the original name is different, but the alternate name is the same. For example, Shangnahexiu 商那和脩 [Śaṇakavāsa] is called Shenaposi 舍那婆斯 and so on.[21] This is because the dialects of the Indian monks who translated at different times were different. [774b29]

With the four patriarchs who follow Poshe, the similarities [in names] are especially detailed. Those listed in the table of contents of the first fascicle number fifty-three, but it is these four who are the most closely related, and [Bodhi]dharma 達磨 is placed at their end. This seems to show he was the very last generation to whom the dharma was transmitted. The high number of those listed is probably because Sengyou obtained all together various catalogues and did not compare their similarities and differences but instead copied them all. [He also] inserts all the collateral disciples from the honored ones Ānanda and Siṃha. Therefore [there is] this complexity. As Sengyou's preface says, "First, I will discuss the differences and similarities between these accounts. Then I will record what I have heard. The worthies of later generations will continue to appear, and they will compose accounts to repair the lacunae."[22] Thus [the *Chu sanzang ji* [*ji*]] is for the most part similar to the *Baolin zhuan* and the [*Jingde*] *chuandeng lu*. Because Sengyou was of the loftiest virtue, the people of his time praised him as a vinaya master. He was a man of learning and percep-

---

[18] Number 49 in the *Chu sanzang ji ji.* Also rendered as Puryamitra.

[19] Most likely Puṇyatāra, an Indian monk from Kashmir, also known as Furuoduoluo 弗若多羅, who was a vinaya specialist, active in Chang'an sometime between 399 and 415, where he worked from 404 in collaboration with Kumārajīva (Hōbōgirin 249).

[20] Number 51 in the *Chu sanzang ji ji.*

[21] The latter is number 4 in the *Chu sanzang ji ji.*

[22] Close to an exact quotation of T.55.2145.89a14–15, although punctuated rather differently. Sengyou writes, "How can one keep the profound teaching in mind and adhere to it and not record and list its men?" (T.55.2145.89a10).

tion, and people have [continued to] praise him up to the present. As he grew up in the Qi [479–502] and grew old in the Liang [502–557], he must have heard these things in detail. His writings are certainly trustworthy. With his text, we can verify that although Siṃha bhikṣu died, his dharma was indeed transmitted and that the transmission of the four patriarchs following Poshe is not an error. It all become very clear, does it not? What the [*Jingde*] *chuandeng* [*lu*] records is surely based on fact. [774c13]

Alas, it has been almost one hundred years since Sengyou's book was included in the great canon and circulated throughout the world, and yet no one grasped what it reveals. How is it that the ancients did not see it? Whether a great man's virtues are neglected or celebrated is a matter of fate. [774c15]

Hence I examined the first translation of the matter. The earlier books all say, "A śramaṇa named Zhijianglianglou 支疆梁樓 originally from central India once went to Kashmir, to that country's Mount Elephant White, where he met the bhikṣu Damoda.[23] This man was unusually old and was a disciple of the collateral line of the patriarch Siṃha. Zhijiang then asked about the fate of the dharma after Siṃha died. Damoda said, 'The dharma of the Tathāgata was transmitted to Mahākāśyapa down to my master, the great teacher Siṃha. Yet my master knew he must himself be killed. When he had not yet died, he predicted [this and] properly transmitted the dharma to my fellow student, a śramaṇa from southern India named Basiasita, also called Poluoduona. *The* Baolin zhuan *says, "He was called in northern India Poluoduoluo.*[24] *The* Chu sanzang ji [ji] *is also the same. Here the text gives "duona" [rather than "duoluo"]. This must be the result of regional differences between translators.* Again [Siṃha] gave a robe [to Basiasita] as a token of trust and sent him back to his own country. He is now propagating Buddhism there with great success. Zhijiang said, 'I know of that man.' Zhijiang in the time of Cao Huan 曹奐 [246-303], Prince of Chen-liu 陳留 in the Former Wei [220–265], arrived in the capital at Luoyi 洛邑.[25] First he lodged at Baima Monastery 白馬寺. At

[23] Zhijianglianglou is said to have translated the *Fahua sanmei jing* In 256 in Jiaozhou [the far south] (Mochizuki, v. 2, 1753–4). See also Tanaka, *Hōrinden yakuchū*, 297.

[24] The extant *Baolin zhuan* says, "This in southern India is a Sanskrit name called Poluoduona." See Tanaka, *Hōrinden yakuchū*, 307–9.

[25] Ancient Luoyang.

that time, the house of Wei was in danger. Cao Huan was troubled by this and many times asked him about the fate of the dynasty. Zhijiang replied entirely in enigmatic words. [Zhijiang] then met the śramaṇas Tandi 曇諦, Kang Sengkai 康僧鎧, and their peers.[26] [They] translated many scriptures and episodes concerning the transmission of all the patriarchs. [They] transmitted these to China.[27] In this way, we know that in China the first news of patriarchs did not begin with the *Fu fazang zhuan*. [775a1]

Yet from the time Zhijiang translated texts concerning these matters to the time Tuoba Dao 拓跋燾 [r. 424–51] killed śramaṇas [i.e., when Tanyao fled], more than one hundred and ninety years had passed. By this time, the story of Zhijiang was certainly already circulating throughout the world. I estimate that within these one hundred ninety-odd years there must have been another [person] who came east to transmit another version of these events. The number of patriarchs must have increased and did not stop at twenty-five generations.[28] It is just that we do not know who came to transmit it. *I have recently used the* Meditation Sūtra 禪經 *to verify this point. It is certain that at this time the number of patriarchs increased.*[29] [775a6]

Kiṅkara and Tanyao, after the destruction of the teaching, drew on old texts to write a book. Then they combined it with sūtras and promulgated it with the power of the state. At that time, even if there was private transmission of this matter, surely it could not equal the prestige of what was issued by Tanyao. People who come afterwards were unable to uncover the circumstances [of this version of the account of the patriarchs]. Noting only that it was not in the canon, they labeled it a false story. Afterwards, the country fluctuated between order and disorder. Though there were again those who obtained [the account], sometimes north and south were cut off from each other, and the years wore on. The book never bore a title, and sometimes the name of the

---

[26] Tandi, also known as Tanwudi 曇無諦, was a Parthian monk who in 255 was at Baima Monastery doing translation work (Tanaka, *Hōrinden yakuchū*, 313). NB: He is not to be confused with the famous Sogdian translator (347–411) of the same name. Kang Sengkai was a monk, possibly Sogdian, who during the Jiaping era (249–253) of the Cao Wei (220–265) was involved in translation work at the Baima Monastery in Luoyang (Mochizuki v. 2, 1066).

[27] The source for the above appears to be the *Baolin zhuan*, (Tanaka, *Hōrinden yakuchū*, 310–13).

[28] This line only makes sense if we read nian 年 to mean "generation."

[29] Qisong discusses this text at great length in a later section.

translator was also missing. The books based on it were coarse, colloquial, and overly embellished. For this reason, scholars believed in it less and less. [775a14]

It is also said that there was a Kashmiri śramaṇa named Nalianyeshe 那連耶舍 who went to Ye 鄴 [Luoyang] during the time of the Emperor Xiaojing 孝静 [r. 534–549] of the Eastern Wei [534–550] and devoted himself to translation. The Gao 高 family usurped the rule of the Wei to establish the [Northern] Qi [550–577], and he translated even more scriptures. In the beginning, with a recluse by the name of Wan Tianyi 萬天懿, he translated the *Zunsheng pusa wuliangmen tuoluoni jing* 尊勝菩薩無量門陀羅尼經.[30] Thereupon he told Wan Tianyi, "The twenty-seven patriarchs of the western land also honored this sūtra." He also pointed to the transmission from Prajñātāra to Bodhidharma and said that the teaching of those succeeded to him [Bodhidharma] in this land would propagate it widely. This he prophesied. Moreover, he brought out the previously translated episodes concerning the patriarchs and gave them to Wan Tianyi as proof. [775a20]

Yang Xuanzhi's 楊衒之 *Mingxi ji* 名系集 also says that Yeshe once met this eastern monk Tanqi 曇啓 in western India.[31] Together they translated texts concerning the patriarchs into the Chinese language. When the translation was completed, Yeshe first carried it eastward. However, it was not different from what Zhijiang had translated. From the seven Buddhas to the twenty-fifth patriarch Basiasita, it came from what Zhijiang translated. [The accounts] that increase the number of patriarchs to twenty-seven or twenty-eight or contain stories about Damoduoluo [Dharmatrāta/Bodhidharma] receiving the dharma in the western regions probably come from Yeshe's translation. Tracing the accounts given in the two books of the *Baolin* and the *Chuandeng* back to Tanyao's simple list, [we see that] all of them are based on the stories of Zhijiang and Yeshe. It is just that in later generations each writer's revision [of the material] differed.[32] [775a29]

If one asks how Zhijiang could have gotten details like this, I would say that Zhijiang was a man of central India. His generation was very

[30] Wan was a Tuoba layman active in Luoyang c. 562–564 (Hōbōgirin 267).

[31] Not in Yang's extant work, the *Luoyang qielan ji*.

[32] Qisong here uses a phrase *bixue* 筆削, meaning to edit or revise, writing and excising as proper, that comes from the *Shiji*'s description of Confucius composing the *Chunqiu*, as Chavannes translates, "il écrivit ce qu'il fallait écrire, il supprima ce qui était à supprimer" (v. 5, pp. 422–423).

near to that of the honored one Siṃha. He saw Basiasita and was able to discuss him with Damoda. Therefore his knowledge was complete. [775b3]

As for the *Chu sanzang ji* [*ji*], [the lineage it gives] might have been based on a separate account that circulated between the Qi and Liang dynasties. Sengyou says, "The Sarvāstivāda School originally arose in India and spread to Kashmir."[33] The kingdom of Kashmir is the place where Siṃha proselytized and also where he met his death. Sengyou's account is detailed. It also says, "This work circulated in the land of Qi."[34] Sengyou was a man of Qi. It must be that a westerner came east before Bodhidharma and transmitted it to Qi. Sengyou in this country acquired it and made it into a book. Only the name of the translator was lost. If this is not the case, how could Sengyou have transmitted it? If one says that Chan monks of China made it, were there then disciples of Bodhidharma in the time of Sengyou? Furthermore, [if Chan monks wrote it,] why does [the lineage] come from the Sarvāstivāda School, and why was it recorded by a vinaya [scholar, i.e., Sengyou]? [775b12]

Ordinarily when we analyze matters, we must infer with reasons, and we must examine by means of evidence. Then later we discuss whether it is so or not. If it were not like this, even if one had intuition as accurate as milfoil divination, what good would it be? [775b14]

Formerly Shenqing 神清 [c. 779–806] reproached Chan [monks] who said that Bodhidharma heard his two disciples had been banished to Mt. Lu by the people of Qin and came himself to Liang.[35] [The people of] Liang did not trust [in him], and [he] observed that the spirit [of the Mahāyāna was in the north] and so proceeded to Wei.[36] There-

---

[33] T.55.2145.89a4.

[34] Exact quotation, T.55.2145.89a3–4.

[35] Here Qisong, using the term ji 譏, seems to be referring to the title of the section of the *Beishan lu* (T. 52. 2113) that he is discussing. It is called "Ji yishuo" 譏異說 [Condemning incorrect stories], and the commentator, Huibao 慧寶 (9th c.), adds, "'Ji' is reproaching what is not so; 'yi' is raising matters that go against what is right" (T.52.610a).

[36] This reading of Qisong's text is possible only with reference to Shenqing's more detailed account, which reads, "A false story says, '[Bodhi]dharma then transmitted the dharma and sent two disciples to China. [They] were banished by Qin people to Mt. Lu. *This is Buddhabhadra*. Thereupon, with Huiyuan [they] produced the *Chanyao jing*. Bodhidharma heard of this, was inspired, and himself left the western land and crossed the sea to Liang. [But] the people of Liang did not put much faith [in him]. Looking north [he saw] the spirit of Mahayana was there and subsequently went

upon [Shenqing] notes that the death of the honored one Siṃha was during the [Southern] Qi [479–501] and that Bodhidharma dispatched his two disciples during the Jin [265–419].[37] With this discrepancy in era, [Shenqing] demolishes the story. [775b18]

Now the death of Siṃha must have been during the time of the prince of Qi, the dethroned emperor of the former Wei [r. 240–253]. *If calculated by Celestial Stems and Earthly Branches, Siṃha's death was in the dingmao year [246]. The* Baolin [zhuan] *mistakenly says it was the jimao year [258].*[38] The title of prince of Qi was in fact bestowed on Cao Fang 曹芳, the prince of Wei, [at some point during 233–237]. Shenqing, however, takes this to be the later Southern Qi [479–501]. *The commentary to Shenqing's text also calls it the Southern Qi.*[39] As for the one "banished by the people of Qin," this must be Buddhabhadra 佛馱跋陀羅. Buddhabhadra was indeed a nephew of the school of Bodhidharma.[40] [The story that Shenqing retells] says that [Bodhidharma] heard that [Buddhabhadra] had been banished and then came himself to Liang. Now as for the coming of the patriarch, he acted in accordance with great karmic conditions in order to transmit the mind-seal of the Buddha. How could he come simply because two disciples were banished?[41] This is preposterous. How could Shenqing use [this story] in his refutation? This being the case, the story is not even worth criticizing. [775b25]

Now Shenqing says, "As far as the gate of the patriarchs [i.e., Chan] is concerned, everyone in the world will flock to it in a return to the principle of benevolence. If one's virtues are lofty, what need is there

---

to Wei. *What this narrates and the* Baolin zhuan *and* Gaoseng zhuan *are intractably different.*" (T.52.611c16–20).

[37] T.52.611c25–26 reads, "As the time of bhikṣu Siṃha corresponded to the time of Qi while Bodhidharma, who occupied [the place of] twenty-ninth [patriarch], lived, by contrast, in the time of Jin, is this not incorrect in its chronology?" It is not clear how Shenqing arrives at this date for Siṃha's death. Qisong seems to be using—and correcting—the *Baolin zhuan*.

[38] Tanaka, *Hōrinden yakuchū*, 294–95.

[39] T.52.611c25.

[40] During Zhiyan and Baoyun's three-year stay in Kashmir, they encountered Buddhabhadra, and learning that he was an esteemed teacher of dhyāna, Zhiyan asked him to come to China as a missionary (Tsukamoto, *A history of early Chinese Buddhism*, v. 1, 437, 452). He was apparently a disciple of Buddhasena and ran into opposition in Chang'an, which led him to seek refuge with Huiyuan at Mt. Lu (Zürcher, *Buddhist Conquest*, 212, 223).

[41] A concrete answer to the question 'Why did Bodhidharma come from the west?'.

to rely on the dharma-transmission to establish a school?"[42] These words of Shenqing's are irresponsible and reckless. Formerly when the Tathāgata was about to "transform" [i.e., die], he said to Mahākāśyapa, "I entrust the eye of the true dharma to you. You should transmit it. Do not allow it to be cut off."[43] Hence the great sage wished him to pass on the true dharma. From him began a school of ten thousand generations. To rectify a multitude of proofs [concerning this school] and to distinguish [it] from other paths is no small matter. [Shenqing] says, "What need is there to rely on the dharma-transmission to establish a school?"[44] Can these be the words of a follower of our [path, i.e., Chan]? [Shenqing] must cling to the *Fu fazang zhuan* in order to analyze the [tradition of] the twenty-eight patriarchs, and he calls [it] a false story of later generations.[45] He also cannot understand that "Damoduoluo" is [Bodhidharma's] dharma and lay names combined and says [this is] not the Bodhidharma [we speak of] today.[46] How little thought there is in this! [775c6]

If one reads books but fails to distinguish the true and false of this path or to inquire into the beginning and end of matters, how then is he any different from a book-seller in the market whose knowledge would not increase even if ten thousand books pass through his hands? [Shen]qing himself claimed that he could write books to promote his teachings, but can we call that which is undetailed like [his work] lofty knowledge?[47] [775c9]

As for the *Baolin zhuan*, by and large it is no different than other books in the names and nationalities of all the patriarchs. This being the case, I have used it. Only the details and incidental events are exaggerated excessively. Sometimes there is bothersome repetition and contradiction of fact and principle. Sometimes there are mistakes and lacunae that, I fear, cannot be examined. This must be [because] the western monks from whom [the tradition] was received spread it care-

---

[42] T.52. 611c21–22. The first line includes a reference to *Analects* 12.1, which Slingerland translates "The Master said, 'Restraining yourself and returning to the rites constitutes Goodness. If for one day you managed to restrain yourself and return to the rites, in this way you could lead the entire world back to Goodness'" (*Analects*, 125).

[43] This particular wording does not correspond exactly to the *Fufazang zhuan*, the *Baolin zhuan* or the *Jingde chuandeng lu*.

[44] Paraphrase of T.52. 611c22.

[45] Reference to T.52. 611b21–22.

[46] Reference to T.52. 611b22–23.

[47] I have not found any such claim in Shenqing's extant work.

lessly and were not careful [about the details], and those who received the transmission were incapable of passing judgment on it. I have excised or abbreviated as appropriate and do not use [the dubious parts]. Chan monks are naive and ignorant, and so their writings are roundabout and confused. They damaged the true works of sages of old so that the stories did not meet with full acceptance in the world. Although they wish to extend [the dharma], on the contrary they end up shortening it. Writing books to pass on the dharma for posterity is surely the grand activity of the sages and worthies. How could one write in this wanton manner? People of later generations, driven by a desire for fame, usurp what belongs to the ancients and compete in producing these stories. Is there no end to people like this? I often sigh over this. [775c20]

Although I cannot express myself in lofty prose, I wished to cut through the many confusions and miscellaneous sections [of the account of Chan lineage] and open up the way of the great sages. I wanted to use the stories of the Chan and Vinaya traditions to investigate the truth and rectify [the erroneous accounts]. When the logic was not proper or the words redundant and false, I excised it. If, though a precedent [could be] seen, it was not extremely complete, then [I] selected that which they had neglected to include in order to supplement [the account]. [775c24]

I determined that, from Śākyamuni Tathāgata to the sixth patriarch Chan master Dajian 大鑑 [Huineng], there are altogether thirty-four sages.[48] The Tathāgata [I present] in an "Essay." The next sages [I present] as "Biographies." After Dajian [Huineng], the dharma was widely transmitted. Thus [I present] "Brief Biographies of All Patriarchs of the Separate Houses." Some [of these lineages] are collateral, descending from his disciples; these [I present as] "Accounts of the Collateral [Lines]." Those who had opinions contributing to the rectification of the lineage are given entries in "Accounts of Lineage Verification."[49] This, along with the treatises I wrote before and after, comes to more than forty parts.[50] Together with the chart of patriarchs, [it has been]

[48] I.e., the Buddha, twenty-eight Indian patriarchs, and five Chinese patriarchs.

[49] This section includes Zhijianglianglou, Buddhabhadra, Sengyou, Nalianyeshe, Bei Xiu, and others who contributed to the material Qisong rallies in support of Chan lineage.

[50] Most likely a reference to the thirty-four separate biographies of patriarchs, the section of separate houses, the section on collateral lines, the section on lineage verification, and the four parts of this very treatise; they total forty-one.

engraved in twelve fascicles.[51] It is called the *Chuanfa zhengzong ji* 傳发正宗記 [Record of the True Lineage of the Transmission of the Dharma]. [776a1]

Part Two (776a)

This part and the two parts of the second fascicle were written after [the first part].

Previously I quoted from the *Chu sanzang ji* [*ji*] what is recorded of four patriarchs in order to raise questions about the errors of the *Fu fazang zhuan*. Consequently [what I had written] was made into a book. Since then it has been seven years. Yet what the *Chu sanzang ji* [*ji*] records is only a general look, and I fear that it cannot halt the disputes [taking place] everywhere. By chance, I happened to see the *[Damoduoluo] chanjing [Meditation Sūtra]* and the preface of the *Xiuxing di bujingguan jing* 修行地不淨觀經, which [tell of] the transmission of the dharma to a multitude of sages. Indeed they give twenty-eight patriarchs in total. The names of the four patriarchs from Basiasita on are [made as] clear and obvious as if the sun and the moon had been unveiled. What Sengyou recorded really has a basis [in fact], while Kiṅkara lacked [certain] accounts. [His work] is even less worthy of examination [than I thought before]. Scholars who have been noisily arguing with each other can stop now. [776a10]

The *Meditation Sūtra* comes from Bodhidharma but was translated by Buddhabhadra. Huiyuan 慧遠 of Mt. Lu wrote a preface for it. *At times the preface of this scripture is missing Huiyuan's name. See the* Chu sanzang ji [ji] *for the most detailed explanation.* The preface of the *Bujingguan jing* was written by the [Liu] Song monk Huiguan 慧觀. [776a13]

Bodhidharma was the direct heir of the Tathāgata. Buddhabhadra was the disciple of Buddhasena 佛大先 so [he] was the nephew of the dharma gate of Bodhidharma. The dharma master Huiyuan inherited from Buddhabhadra. Huiguan was also the disciple of Buddhabhadra. What they recount of their patriarchs and lineage is surely properly detailed and complete. [776a17]

The *Meditation Sūtra* says, "After the extinction of the Buddha, [there followed] the honored one Mahākāśyapa, the honored one Ānanda,

[51] In the Taishō version, these are only ten fascicles.

the honored one Madhyāntika 末田地, the honored one Śaṇakavāsa, *This is Shangnahexiu* the honored one Youpoqu 優波堀, *This is Juduo [Upagupta]* the honored one Poxumi 婆須蜜, the honored one Sengqieyou 僧伽又 *In the text in the library of the Lingyin* 靈隐 *[Monastery in Hangzhou], after "Sengqie" is written the character* you 又 *At first I understood the word* you *in terms of its meaning. Afterwards I saw the sūtra of another place where [his name] was written "Sengqieluocha"* 僧伽羅叉 *and understood my previous mistake in understanding the word* you *[because it should be read as* cha*]. Thus "Sengjialuocha" is a patriarch of collateral descent from the patriarch Siṃha of our lineage. The argument appears in detail in the text of my "On dissecting wrong views."*[52] the honored one Monaluo 摩拏羅 *I once analyzed this. He is [also] called the twenty-fifth patriarch Poluoduoluo* [i.e., Basiasita]. *He is called also an 'honored one.' He must be the twenty-fifth patriarch and [the one who] inherited from the twenty-fourth patriarch Siṃha. The transmission [of the dharma] did not end. Now the sūtra* [*Meditation Sūtra*] *itself says, "Damoduoluo" [Dharmatrāta]. This is an error of the transmitted writing of later generations. [It cannot be that] Dharmatrāta is the man who preached the sūtra and the dharma-transmission disciple of Buruoduoluo* [i.e., Prajñātāra]. *How can a disciple preach the dharma and call himself honored one before his master? [The reason for the mistake] is that the characters for Dharmatrāta and Prajñātāra are close to each other. The ancient worthies also analyzed this and called him Monaluo. I fear it is not so. For now I follow my worthy predecessors.* And to the honored one Buruomiduoluo 不若蜜多羅 *Only the character* mi 蜜 *is redundant in the text and different from what the* [Jingde] Chuandeng lu *has.* All those who held the dharma passed on this lamp of wisdom one to another. Now I explain this meaning as I have heard it."[53] [776a27]

The one called the honored one Mahākāśyapa in the *Meditation Sūtra* is the first patriarch of our true lineage. [The *Meditation Sūtra*] says "and to the honored one Buruomiduoluo."[54] This is the twenty-seventh patriarch of our true lineage, and his disciple who preached the sūtra [i.e., the *Meditation Sūtra*] was Dharmatrāta, the twenty-eighth patriarch of our true lineage. In the many stories of the *Baolin*

---

52 No extant work by this name.
53 A quotation from T.15.618.301c6–10, exact but for two names, Sengqieluocha and Damoduoluo, both of whom Qisong discusses at length.
54 T.15.618.301c9.

[*zhuan*] and [*Jingde*] *Chuandeng* [*lu*], there is no discrepancy between the names and numbers of these so-called twenty-eight patriarchs. The reason that the *Meditation Sūtra* does not list each patriarch one by one in order must be that at that time [its author] wanted to concentrate on preaching the dharma.[55] [The text] only indicates the people at the beginning and the end. One knows, however, that the rest of the patriarchs are in the middle. [776b7]

The preface to the *Xiuxingdi bujingguan jing* 修行地不淨觀經 says, "[He] transmitted this dharma to Kashmir. *Kashmir is the country where the patriarch Siṃha proselytized.* [He] passed it on to Furuomiduo. *That is, Puṇyamitra [Burumiduo].* Furuomiduo also exhausted all defilements and possessed all six supranormal powers. Later [it came] down to his disciple Furuoluo. *That is, Prajñātāra [Panreduoluo].* He also attained arhatship. These two were the heads of the teaching in Kashmir. *The* Baolin [zhuan] *and* [Jingde] Chuandeng [lu] *say that these two honored ones preached successfully in eastern and southern India. Here it says they were the heads of the teaching in Kashmir. It must be that Kashmiri monks and followers esteemed and looked up to these men as heads of the lineage of the dharma. Probably these two men also journeyed to and from Kashmir.* [776b13]

"It has been over fifty years since Furuomiduo [i.e., Puṇyamitra] died and more than twenty since his disciple [Furuoluo/Prajñātāra] died. *Huiguan was Buddhabhadra's disciple. These two men both died in the [Liu] Song* [420–479]. *Now the dharma-inheriting patriarchs traced by Huiguan's preface to the scripture are the same as those in what Buddhabhadra translated at Mt. Lu. However, the titles of the two scriptures are different. Furthermore, in investigating the dates of death for the two patriarchs Furuomiduo [i.e., Puṇyamitra] and Furuoluo [i.e., Prajñātāra], [we see that they] differ from what is given in the* Baolin *and* Chuandeng. *In examining this, [we find that] perhaps after Buddhabhadra, Huiguan translated the texts of this sūtra again and wrote a preface for it himself. Perhaps he received a general account saying that Furuoluo [i.e. Prajñātāra] entered nirvāṇa [at a particular time] and thereupon recorded it. Perhaps the two Indian monks from whom [the author of the]* Baolin *and Huiguan received their accounts belonged to different schools and lineages. Perhaps the general accounts of the five regions of India were not accurate. Perhaps by the time it was trans-*

[55] The *Meditation Sūtra* gives a list of nine names.

mitted to this land, much time had passed. Because of over-reliance on sūtras and under-estimation of the teachings [of the different schools], those who transmitted the writing made errors that led to lacunae and confusion. I only use the dharma-inheriting patriarchs [in the accounts]. As for the precise years when they entered nirvāṇa, it does not matter very much even if there are slight differences. It is like the stories of the multitude of schools not agreeing on the birthday of the Buddha. How could I say it is not our Buddha? According to Huijiao's 慧皎 *account [in the* Gaoseng zhuan 高僧傳*], Buddhabhadra died in the sixth year of Yuanjia* 元嘉 *[429], and Huiguan only completed the preface to the* Shengman jing 勝鬘經 *in the thirteenth year of Yuanjia [436]. [Thus we] know that Huiguan died after Buddhabhadra.* [776b19]

"The bodhisattva Tanmoduoluo 曇摩多羅 *That is, Damoduoluo [Dharmatrāta]* and Fotuosina 佛陀斯那 *That is, Fodaxian* 佛大先 *[Buddhasena]* together sought and obtained lofty accomplishments and propagated the fundamentals of the dharma. Buddhasena preached in Kashmir as the third head of the teaching."[56] *For this preface and the preface of Huiyuan, see the ninth fascicle of the* Chu sanzang ji [ji]. [776b21]

The one Huiguan called Furuomiduo [i.e., Puṇyamitra] is the twenty-sixth patriarch of our true lineage, and the one called Furuoluo [i.e., Prajñātāra] is the twenty-seventh patriarch of our true lineage. The one called Tanmoduoluo bodhisattva is the twenty-eighth patriarch of our true lineage. The one called Fotuosina is the same as the Fodaxian [Buddhasena] who received instructions with [i.e., was a co-disciple] Bodhidharma. [776b27]

What [the *Meditation Sūtra*] seems to say about how this dharma was transmitted to Kashmir and on to Furuomiduo [i.e., Puṇyamitra] is that the twenty-fourth patriarch Siṃha was the first to transmit it to Kashmir. Then [it continued] from the twenty-fifth patriarch Basiasita and was given in turn to the twenty-sixth patriarch. Do they not all need to be listed? The names of the two patriarchs Siṃha and [Basi] asita are shortened. It is only the words of the two books [i.e., *Baolin zhuan* and [*Jingde*] *Chuandeng lu*] that are slightly different. Perhaps [they are] complete, perhaps shortened. There are some slight discrepancies with all the accounts of the lineages today. [This might be

[56] T.55.2145.66c21–27 with a few insignificant discrepancies.

due to] differences in regional dialects used to make the translations. [776c4]

I note that in Huijiao's *Gaoseng zhuan*, it says that Buddhabhadra "received teaching from the great Chan master Buddhasena."[57] *Sometimes the account makes the scribal error of the character* guang 光 *[for xian* 先*].* [He] started in Kashmir and, invited by the monk Zhiyan 智嚴, came east with him.[58] [He] first reached Kumārajīva 羅什 in Chang'an. Whenever he conversed with Kumārajīva, they got along well. Once he said to Kumārajīva, "Your explanations are nothing extraordinary, and yet you have become very famous. Why?" Kumārajīva said, "It is because I am old. What need is there to be able to speak beautifully?"[59] Soon thereafter, [Later] Qin [384–417] monks, because of a certain matter, expelled Buddhabhadra [from Chang'an]. Then [Buddhabhadra] came to dharma master Huiyuan of Mt. Lu who, on his behalf, sent off a letter to annul the expulsion.[60] Thereupon he translated the *Meditation Sūtra* under Huiyuan. [776c11]

The account of Buddhabhadra in Sengyou's *Chu sanzang ji* also says, "At Mt. Lu, with Huiyuan, he translated a scripture on the counting of the breath in meditation."[61] The present-day national imperial printing of the *Meditation Sūtra* in the initial title says, "Translated by the Trepiṭaka Buddhabhadra of the Eastern Jin." This makes clear that he translated the text with Huiyuan. [776c14]

As for Buddhabhadra receiving teaching from the great Chan master Buddhasena, Buddhasena was in fact the disciple who transmitted the dharma of the twenty-seventh master Prajñātāra and thus the co-disciple of Bodhidharma in the same branch. Therefore, Huiyuan wrote in the [preface to the] *Meditation Sūtra*, "What is translated now is from Bodhidharma and Buddhasena. These men were the leading talents of the western regions, models of Chan teaching."[62] The *Baolin zhuan* says, "Buddhasena was the disciple of Buddhabhadra. Bodhidharma began studying the dhyāna and samādhi of the Hīnayāna with Buddhabhadra. Later together with Buddhasena, [he] received

---

57 T.50.2059.334c18–19.
58 Summary of T.50.2059.334c8, 13–22.
59 Exact quote of T.50.2059.335a5–7.
60 T.50.2059.335b13–16.
61 Summary of T.55.2145.104a2–4.
62 T.55.2145.66a10–12.

the dharma from Prajñātāra."[63] The [practitioners of the] Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna teach and learn from each other, like Kumārajīva and Bandhudatta 般頭達多.[64] Examples of this were numerous in the western regions. Is it the case that Bodhidharma and others began by asking Buddhabhadra about dhyāna and samādhi and that afterwards Buddhabhadra realized the great dharma from Bodhidharma and hence that the words of the two books are like this? Although this is the lesser dharma, it is perhaps true that even sages must have teachers. Accounts say that Bodhidharma was the avatar of Guanyin and at seven years of age knew the four Vedas and the collections on the five sciences. Longing for the dharma, he went on to master the three baskets [of the Buddhist teaching]. He was particularly skilled in the matter of samādhi. What need was there for him to learn from others? [776c27]

The story of the *Baolin zhuan* is indeed close to the [story of the] *Meditation Sūtra*; only the order seems to be reversed. Perhaps the western monks who transmitted [the material found] in the *Baolin* [*zhuan*] were not refined. If we judge on the basis of the *Meditation Sūtra*, logically, no master transmits the sūtras of his own disciples. Now Buddhabhadra transmitted and translated Bodhidharma's *Meditation Sūtra*, so Buddhabhadra was a follower of Bodhidharma. I can surely regard the words of Huijiao and Huiyuan as detailed. I infer that Buddhabhadra was indeed the disciple of Buddhasena [and] thus the dharma nephew of Bodhidharma. Huiguan's preface to the scripture also says, "Tanmoluo 曇摩羅 transmitted the essentials of this dharma to Potuoluo 婆陀羅."[65] *Potuoluo is Bhadra* 跋陀羅*. The* Baolin zhuan *calls him only Batuo* 跋陀*. This refers to Prajñātāra. In southern India today there is no evidence of his transmission of the dharma. The* Baolin *cannot be taken as proof.* Now Buddhabhadra transmitted the sūtra of his [dharma] uncle. He listed the names and clans of his patriarchs. Surely [this indicates an] intimate [connection]! It is not mistaken.

---

[63] This seems to be from the missing seventh fascicle of the *Baolin zhuan* and does not appear in Shiina Kōyū's reconstruction of it from other sources ("'Hōrinden' itsubun no kenkyū"). Without the original, it is not clear where the line ends.

[64] Bandhudatta is more often written with the characters *pan* 盘 or *pan* 槃. Kumārajīva took Bandhudatta as his master and then later, after studying Mahāyāna elsewhere, returned to convert Bandhudatta, who then took Kumārajīva as his 'Mahāyāna' master. See the *Gaoseng zhuan*, T.50.2059.330b7–331b10.

[65] Condensed from T.55.2145.67a2. Qisong takes Tanmoluo to be a form of the name Dharmatrāta, which he believes to be another name for Bodhidharma.

The *Baolin zhuan* says, "Buddhabhadra once said to dharma master Huiyuan, 'In the western land, there have already been twenty-seven patriarchs.'" Yet Buruoduoluo [i.e., Prajñātāra] had only just begun preaching in southern India. This proves the point. *Buruoduoluo was still alive. Bodhidharma had not yet succeeded [him] and become patriarch. For this reason, [he] was not yet spoken of.* [Huijiao's] account of Buddhabhadra says, "Buddhabhadra was banished by Qin monks and left with his disciples, Huiguan and others, altogether more than forty people. His mind was composed, and from the beginning his expression did not change."[66] Examining this, [we know] then that the description of the lineage in Huiguan's preface comes from Buddhabhadra. A careful look at his preface shows that the *Bujingguan jing* and *Meditation Sūtra* are properly one. It is only that I have not yet seen the original text and cannot judge. [777a15]

In investigating the date of Buddhabhadra's translation of the sūtra, I find that it occurred between the seventh and eighth year of the Yixi 義熙 period of [Emperor] An of the Jin 晋安 [411–12]. Yet Bodhidharma came to the Liang 梁 at the beginning of the Putong 普通 [520–526]. These events are separated by almost one hundred years. This is probably because of Bodhidharma's unusual longevity. [Emperor] Wu 武 of the Liang composed an epitaph for Bodhidharma in which he says, "His age was one hundred fifty years." *The* Xu gaoseng zhuan 續高僧傳 *also says this.*[67] The Liang emperor spoke of human matters. When [Bodhidharma] died and was buried, he rose again, took one shoe, and returned westward. How can [one] calculate his longevity with years? I infer from the year Buddhabhadra translated the scripture that Bodhidharma was then only twenty-seven roughly. His preaching of the *Meditation Sūtra* was surely before that. [Huiyuan's] preface mentions "the leading talents of the western regions, models of Chan teaching."[68] This must mean that Buddhabhadra knew that this sage [Bodhidharma] had a great karmic destiny in the world and that he would inherit the Chan patriarchate. [He] predicted this to Huiyuan. Buddhabhadra was himself also an immeasurable man. It is fitting that he knew the sage Bodhidharma. [777a26]

---

66 T.50.2059.335b5–6.
67 T.50.2060.551c25.
68 T.55.2145.66a11–12.

As for the transmission of the dharma to a multitude of sages, its traces begin with Zhijianglianglou translating a book called the *Xufa zhuan* 續法傳.[69] Formerly, when Tuoba Dao destroyed the [Buddhist] teaching, Zhijiang's book was lost. After this came the age of Tanyao and Kiṅkara. They patched [some material] back together to make a book. What they recorded was sometimes complete, sometimes riddled with holes. Later still, the [Emperor] Wu of the Zhou 周武 [r. 560–578] and the [Emperor] Wuzong of the Tang 唐武宗 [r. 840–846] destroyed the teaching, and the book was lost again. Although those of later generations again gathered and combined [material] to make a book, the gap between the complete [original] and the incomplete [reconstruction] increased. Despite the fact that from ancient times up to the present, many have discussed this, what they quoted was disorderly and arbitrary, it has not been sufficient for making a judgment. It does not compare to the detailed verification [I will provide] now with the *Meditation Sūtra* and Huiguan's preface. [777b4]

Of all that the world grasps onto in order to quarrel with our lineage gate, the *Fu fazang zhuan* is used the most. I will now examine this book. It was written in the second year of the Yanxing 延興 [472] of the Later Wei while the *Meditation Sūtra* translated by Buddhabhadra appeared during the seventh and eighth year [411–12] of the Yixi era of the [Emperor] An 安 [r.396–419] of the Jin 晉. The Yixi era preceded the Yanxing era by sixty-two years. *The translation of the* Meditation Sūtra *was in the seventh or eighth year of the Yixi era [411–12]. According to the biography of Buddhabhadra in Sengyou's* Chu sanzang ji [ji], *he arrived at Mt. Lu, and from summer until winter, he translated the* Meditation Sūtra. *In the eighth year of Yixi [412], he went to Jingzhou* 荆州.[70] *Huijiao's* Gaoseng zhuan *says that Buddhabhadra went to Mt. Lu and stayed a year or so and then went west to Jiangling* 江陵.[71] *The* Fu fazang zhuan *came out later, in the second year of the*

[69] Qisong has referred to Zhijiang before (774c–775a), but this is the first time he gives a title for his purported translation. I have been unable to find any reference to this title other than that to a *Xufa ji* 續法記 in interlinear notes in the *Baolin zhuan* (Tanaka, *Hōrinden yakuchū*, 296–97).

[70] Summarizes T.55.2145.104 a3–5, which refers to him translating a number of meditation sūtras (*Chan shu zhu jing* 禪數諸經). Jingzhou is in modern-day Hubei.

[71] Summarizes T.50.2059.335b12,17. Jiangling is in modern-day Hubei, a district that includes Jingzhou.

Yanxing era (472). See the beginning of the book.[72] In this way then, the *Meditation Sūtra* was in fact first seen in the southern dynasties while the *Fu fazang zhuan* appeared later, after the destruction of the teaching in the northern dynasties. Is it right to cling to a book which appeared later in just one region in order to supplement a lost text and to challenge what is found in the complete text that appeared earlier? [777b13]

There are those who say that when Zhijianglianglou first wrote the *Xufa zhuan*, originally there were twenty-five patriarchs up to Basiasita.[73] That is to say, those who transmitted the dharma were not cut off at the bhikṣu Siṃha. It is also said that Jifuyan 吉弗煙 and Tanyao at the same time separately revised this as the *Wuming ji* 五明集. *This might have been an expansion of the* Fu fazang zhuan. *Jifuyan is Kiṅkara.*[74] It also said that there were twenty-seven generations and that [the transmission] did not stop at the patriarch Siṃha. The proof is missing because when Tanyao first met with the difficulties of the [Northern] Wei emperor Wu's destruction of the dharma, he hurriedly made a simple record, fled to the mountains and marshes, and then lost it. [777b19]

By means of [the information on] the twenty-eight patriarchs found in current [versions of] the *Meditation Sūtra* and Huiguan's preface, I have examined [the question of] their existence, and, as a result, [I have concluded that] the transmission is not flawed. The mistake [of thinking the transmission ended with Siṃha] was certainly brought about by Tanyao. Also, the *Wuming ji* has not been seen again. Even if someone occasionally obtained [a copy of] it, it was given a different title, like in the cases of the *Baolin zhuan* and the *Shengzhou ji* 聖胄集.[75] Furthermore, it does not list the name of the translator. Neither could later generations investigate the truth of it. Only in what Tanyao first

---

[72] The Taishō text does not furnish a date, but Sengyou gives the date of 472 (T.55.2145.13b7, 9–11).

[73] No known source for this claim other than *Baolin zhuan*.

[74] This is the first appearance of this claim that Kiṅkara [Jijiaye] is Jifuyan. The *Baolin zhuan* seems to be Qisong's source for the raw material for this claim. It mentions the *Wuming ji* twice in an interlinear notes (Tanaka, *Hōrinden yakuchū*, 282–83, 331–32). In the latter reference, the author is given as the Trepiṭaka Foyan 佛煙 of the Later Wei. Later in the text, there is mention of a Northern Indian named Jifuyan 吉弗煙, a translation of the name Fotuoshanduo 佛陀扇多, who wrote the *Wuming* (Tanaka, *Hōrinden yakuchū*, 445–46).

[75] On this text, see Tanaka, "*Shōchū shū* kō" and "*Shōchū shū* no rekishiteki seikaku."

patched together appear both his name and that of Kiṅkara. This being the case, Kiṅkara's book is not the true text. Surely this can be seen. Scholars lacking in judgment just read this book—which says that when the king of Kashmir because of his false views beheaded the bhikṣu Siṃha with a sharp sword, from his head flowed no blood, only milk and that at this, the transmitters of the dharma were cut off—and immediately took this account to be true.[76] Unexpectedly, past scholars affiliated with different schools slandered the Chan school for this reason, arousing the disbelief of later generations. [777c1]

If the truth is that there was no one to whom the dharma was transmitted, those who are knowledgeable [would] write [about it] directly. They would simply not write about one who had inherited the dharma, and people would see for themselves the lack [of a dharma heir]. What need is there to write that the transmission was cut off? These words are cruel and coarse. Indeed, someone who was not satisfied with the aftermath of the destruction of teaching took delight in the disappearance of the text about lineage and availed himself of the affair of Siṃha to forge something incorrect about dharma-heirs. Then he spread [this fiction] under the name of the Indian monk Kiṅkara. However, Kiṅkara [Jijiaye] is also named Jifuyan. Many say that he wrote the *Wuming ji*, [in which the transmission] does not stop at twenty-four generations. With this, I have examined the *Fu fazang zhuan*. Does it not rely on Kiṅkara? Even if Tanyao did not write it at that time, another person must have done it after the Zhou emperor Wu's destruction of the teaching. Otherwise, how could it be that both the *Meditation Sūtra* and the *Chu sanzang ji [ji]* are complete, and it is so lacking. I say this erroneous book can be burnt. *That is, the* Fu fazang zhuan. [777c11]

Fascicle Two

Part Three

A visitor said to me, "I hear that the true lineage is transmitted from mind to mind only, but you keep alluding to the *Meditation Sūtra*. Why is that?"[77]

---

[76] Summarizes T.2058.321c15–18.

[77] An unusually blunt reference to the seeming contradiction between Qisong's historigraphical efforts and Chan transcendence of language.

I said, "I allude to the *Meditation Sūtra* because the names and numbers of patriarchal masters that appear in it are full of subtle meanings, which accord with our true lineage. The narration of the true lineage by the great master of Mt. Lu [i. e., Huiyuan] is particularly detailed, as is the preface of Huiguan. When I wrote of it, I presented it merely as evidence. I do not study the *Meditation Sūtra* [as such] but use it specifically for its meaning." [777c20]

The visitor said, "I understand [consulting it for] the names and numbers of patriarchal masters, but how can you say that Huiyuan's narration is very detailed?"

I said, "According to the record in Sengyou's *Chu sanzang ji [ji]*, the 'General Preface to *Lushan chu xiuxing fangbian chanjing*' 廬山出修行方便禪經統序 [is by] Shi Huiyuan.'[78] I examined this preface and searched for the purpose in his integrating [elements of Buddhist practice]. It says, 'The flourishing of the three activities takes meditation and wisdom as the main principle.'[79] It says, 'The principles are mysterious, the number[ed doctrines] many; the path is concealed in written language. This is why Ānanda received oral teachings [*yinzhao*音詔] completely.'[80] *Manuscripts of this scripture sometimes have this as* yinshao 音韶 *because of the scribal errors of copyists in later generations. I examined Huiyuan's* Kuangshan ji 匡山集 *and saw the* General Preface to the *Meditation Sūtra*.[81] *It in fact said* zhizhao 旨詔

---

[78] T.55.2145.65b21–22. Tsukamoto takes this to refer to a "general" preface to the meditation scriptures translated by Buddhabhadra (*A history of early Chinese Buddhism*, v. 2,881). Zürcher takes it to be a preface for one particular sūtra (v. 2, 399, n. 221) and writes that Buddhabhadra translated only one text (*Buddhist Conquest*, v. 1, 223).

[79] T.55.2145.65b23. In translating the following extensive quotations from Huiyuan's preface, I have consulted the Japanese translation and notes by Kimura Eiichi et al. (*Eon kenkyū*, 443–452), Tsukamoto Zenryū's partial Japanese translation (note that he also consulted Kimura), Leon Hurvitz's rendering of Tsakamoto's translation into English (*History of Early Chinese Buddhism*, v. 2, 883–4, 997–8), and John McRae's partial translation (*The Northern School*, 81–82). Much of the translation remains tentative.

[80] T.55.2145.65c4–5. Kimura reads this as 'receiving oral teachings in detail' and understands it to be a conventional reference to Ānanda as the attendant of the Buddha who heard all his sermons and after the Buddha's death recited them from memory for the assembly of arhats (*Eon kenkyū*, 444, 449). There appears to be a contrast between written and oral language here, at least in one recension, but Qisong wants to go farther, beyond language altogether, in order to read into the text an implication of secret, non-verbal transmission. Mahākāśyapa is missing from this account, though he is mentioned in the *Meditation Sūtra* itself.

[81] Kuangshan is another name for Lushan.

[teaching of the principle]. Guifeng [Zongmi]'s 圭峯[宗密] Puxian xing yuan shu 普賢行願疏 *also calls it* zhizhao 旨詔.[82] *It must be that Guifeng relied on the preface to the old original scripture from before the Zhou and Tang 'winnowings.'*[83] *It says '(receiving the teaching of the principle completely' [曲承旨詔].* Qu 曲 *is an expression meaning 'meticulous and thorough.' If one says 'oral teaching' [音詔], how can the meaning be subtle? The dharma master Huiguan's preface to the* Bujingguan jing also *says 'accepting the sagely principle completely' [曲奉聖旨].*[84] *The* Bujingguan jing *is thus the* Meditation Sūtra. *I did not in the beginning dare to alter the words of the great national canon. After this I took* zhizhao 旨詔 *to be correct. Please regard it henceforth as the standard.*

[Huiyuan's preface continues:]

> When encountering people who were not [fit to receive the teaching], [Ānanda] had to hide it in his mind [lit., 'numinous seat'].[85] Why? Because the mind has no regulation; its changes are many. The subjects of numbers are not fixed; they respond to circumstance.[86] For this reason, when [Ānanda] was preaching in India, [he] had his teaching sealed by a craftsman [did not want them transmitted at the wrong time]. The dark gate was not opened, and rarely was the courtyard glimpsed. From this it can be observed that the principle is sometimes used and sometimes hidden, and the way should not bestowed in vain.[87] This is very reasonable. [778a7]
>
> Not long after the nirvāṇa of the Tathāgata, Ānanda transmitted [the dharma] to Madhyāntika, his fellow disciple. Madhyāntika transmitted it to Śaṇakavāsa. These three arhats had all, by means of their ultimate vow, secretly established an affinity in the past. Their attainments were beyond words, not discussed in the scriptures. Certainly they were secretly in line with that of the original craftsman. *The 'original*

---

[82] This is presumably the "(Dafangguang Fo) Huayan jing (Puxian) xingyuan pin shu chao" XZJ Vol. 5, No. 229 (大方廣佛) 華嚴經行願品疏鈔 (Manji zokuzokyo 7.773–1011), but I have been unable to find this line.

[83] I.e., persecutions, see Zürcher, *Buddhist Conquest*, v. 1, 214.

[84] T.55.2145.66c6.

[85] Kimura (*Eon kenkyū*, 449) identifies the phrase *lingfu* 靈府 as a term from the *Zhuangzi*.

[86] The translation of the first phrase is uncertain. For the second, Kimura points to similar phrases in the classical works and Chinese Buddhist works (*Eon kenkyū,* 449).

[87] The term *xingcang* 行藏 abridges a comment from Confucius to Yan Hui in *Analects* 7.11, which Slingerland translates, "When he is employed, he moves forward; when he is removed from office, he holds himself in reserve" (*Analects*, 67). Kimura (*Eon kenkyū*, 449) argues that the phrase *dao buxu shou* 道不虛授 is based on a line in the *Yijing* 易經. Wilhelm/Baynes translates, "If you are not the right man/The meaning will not manifest itself to you" (349)—very different than the meaning here.

craftsman' is a simile for the Buddha. There was no discrepancy at all [between their attainments and that of the Buddha]. [778a10]

After them was Upagupta. He was young but exceedingly intelligent. His knowledge was unparalleled in the world.[88] His talent was so high that responses to it were few. When encountering principles, he followed the basics, preserving only the essentials of eighty thousand dharmas. The five divisions [of vinaya] began from this. Because of this, I infer, surely one can know that [phenomena of] form display signs according to their state of decline or flourishing while mental activity functions secretly and leaves no trace. It is difficult to inquire into its subtle movement; when we venture into the coarse, disagreements arise. How can one not be cautious at this? How can one not examine it? [778a14]

From then on, whenever [those possessing this teaching] felt the situation changing, they held to the old texts. The five schools of [vinaya] also had people [fit to receive the teachings]. They all feared that the great dharma would one day be destroyed. The import of the principle became more obscure. And so each commented on the *Meditation Sūtra* to make this activity [of meditation] flourish."[89] *They commented not on the* Meditation Sūtra *but on the dharma essence of this scripture.* [778a17]

"[Huiyuan's preface to the *Meditation Sūtra*] says, 'Many follow the branch to seek the root, while few know how to manipulate the tip by mastering the base. Some almost arrive but do not reach the destination. Some cling to their biases and do not know how to change.'[90] [The preface] says:

> Investigating the intention of the sage [the Buddha], [we find that] he wanted not only to establish the advanced but also wanted to aid the slow. If this is done, the different practices of the five schools will be preserved by suitable people. Because such suitable people do not appear in each successive generation, the path sometimes flourishes and sometimes declines. There are times of neglect and of rejuvenation so that [the teaching] alternately ascends and descends. How could the category of great and small be fixed? Moreover, he understands the crisis well and is good at adapting to the changes of the world. Obscuring his name and covering his tracks, nothing is heard of him and he does not give

---

[88] Following Kimura (*Eon kenkyū*, 450) in reading *jue* 絕 for *zhong* 終.

[89] T.55.2145.65c5–19. McRae translates this line: "Therefore, they each wrote meditation sūtras in order to promote the practice [of meditation]" (*Northern School*, 81); Qisong understands this line as a reference to the *Meditation Sūtra*, not to meditation sūtras in general.

[90] T.55.2145.65c20–22. Kimura (*Eon kenkyū*, 450) notes that 'some' take *ben* 本 to refer to Buddhabhadra and *mo* 末 to refer to Kumārajīva so that this becomes a comparative statement.

> instruction. In the case of such a person, it is not possible to identify by name or school. He is not one who [can be] distinguished by name or school, nor does he go beyond them. It is clear that it is a separate teaching.[91] [778a24]

"[The preface] says, 'What has been translated now comes from Dharmatrāta and Buddhasena. These people were the leading talents of the western regions, models of Chan teaching. They sought and gathered the essence of sūtras in order to promote the great vehicle.'[92] [The preface] says, 'Who, if not a person whose path excels in the three vehicles and whose wisdom extends to the ten stages [of the bodhisattva path], could penetrate the mysterious basis of the dharma-kāya [and] return to the oneness of the markless? [Only the mind of such a person] is quiet without losing illumination and moves without abandoning tranquility.'[93] [778a29]

"Judging from these several stories, could it not be that Ānanda and Upagupta completely received the teaching? [They] waited for the person [who was fit] and secretly transmitted [the teaching]. That which Huiyuan calls 'attainment beyond words, not discussed in the scriptures'[94] unifies the one great teaching of our Śākyamuni Buddha: his sūtras, the vinaya, and the śāstras. None of those who study these three do so without recourse to that through which the utmost is reached. That is why Sengyou calls this preface *tongxu* 統序 [a general, or unified, preface]. Huijiao's *Gaoseng zhuan* says that Buddhabhadra left Qin, met Huiyuan at Mt. Lu, and translated several scriptures on meditation.[95] Sengyou's *Chu sanzang ji [ji]* also says of Buddhabhadra that he once translated this *Meditation Sūtra* with Huiyuan.[96] Thus Huiyuan was transmitted this dharma-essence from Buddhabhadra. Buddhabhadra had received it from Bodhidharma. The reason this preface is vast, marvelous, and secret like this is perhaps because [Huiyuan] succeeded in clarifying the ideas of the author of the scripture. Such is the meticulousness of those who knew our true lineage. [778b10]

"The *Song gaoseng zhuan* in its discussion of meditation says, 'When the dharma was proclaimed at the Han court, word of ultimate

---

91 T.55.2145.65c22–28.
92 T.55.2145.66a10–12.
93 T.55.2145.66a21–23.
94 T.55.2145.65c11–12.
95 Summary of T.50.2059.335b3–14.
96 T.55.2145.104a3–4 actually tells us that Buddhabhadra translated (without Huiyuan's assistance) "some" texts on meditation.

realization had not yet become known [in China]. Only when the practice came to Mt. Lu did the study of dhyāna began to sprout. Buddhajīva 佛馱什 was expelled from the Qin and came [to Mt. Lu].[97] Banreduo 般若多 came to the Jin to pay tribute. At that time Huiyuan was secretly transmitting a method of seated [meditation]. He grasped deeply the profound principle, and gradually he spread the practice. At times he relied on the patriarchs' teaching and at times he deviated from it.'[98] What it is called 'relying' is his relying on the essence of the dharma. 'Deviating' is deviating from the traces of the teaching. Having investigated this, [I conclude that] the essence was transmitted to Huiyuan by Buddhabhadra. How could it be otherwise? *The chronicler refers to Buddhabhadra and Prajñā. These two men both appear to have gone to Mt. Lu. From which of them was the secret transmission to Huiyuan, in the end, obtained? The story that Prajñā also went [to Mt. Lu] does not appear in the accounts by Sengyou and Huijiao. I fear that the chronicler did not look carefully into the book upon which he drew. Zanning 賛寧 also did not think the matter over. Now judging by the translation of this scripture, I have determined that Huiyuan received the transmission from Buddhabhadra and that Buddhabhadra had obtained it from Bodhidharma. The preface of Huiguan clarifies the point in detail. This 'Banreduo' appears to be close to the name of the twenty-seventh patriarch [Prajñātāra]. Verifying this with accounts and records, [we see that] the twenty-seventh patriarch is not heard to have come [to China] in the Jin but simply entered nirvāṇa in India. If this sage suddenly came and went [from China], he must have come early by means of supranormal powers in order to lay a foundation for Bodhidharma and the Chan lineage. If this is the case, it is a matter of sage who cannot be fathomed. If it is not the case, then there truly was a Banreduo. Perhaps he was sent by the patriarchs to come first to reveal the principle of meditation. Later, if anyone raises doubts with this matter, the readers can correct him with my notes.* [778b21]

"At the time of Huiyuan, Bodhidharma had not yet come. The people of China had not yet begun to hear even a little about the story of the secret transmission of the ultimate verification [i.e., awakening]. Although Huiyuan had obtained it himself, to make it known immediately would shock the assembly and give rise to slander. And so he

[97] Presumably a mistake for Buddhabhadra.
[98] T.50.2061.789b18–21.

gathered that he could not do this alone. When the scripture came out, he then explicated it [in his preface]. Yet what he says is most obscure and at times not related to the words of the scripture. The meaning was in the hidden essence of the scripture. It is not proper to seek it amidst the trifling thirty thousand-odd words [of the scripture]. For example, [the preface] says 'Ānanda received the principle of the teaching completely,' but this is not included in the scripture. And [the preface] first names Mahākāśyapa. This must be out of a special desire to clarify that Ānanda transmitted outside the teaching of the scriptures of the Buddha and separately received this profound principle. If it is not so, how could it be different than the scripture? [778c1]

"As for the preface of Huiguan, although its general outline is the same as Huiyuan's story, the title of the scripture and the identity of the person who preached the scripture are ambiguous and not very clearly distinguished. I do not recommend it as a coherent discussion. The only area in which Huiguan is to be admired is that he distinguishes completely the names and numbers of patriarchs, which are the same as our true lineage. About it he says, 'Ānanda accepted the sage principle completely [so it might] continue a thousand years.'[99] And he says, 'Tanmoluo transmitted this essence of the dharma to Futuoluo. Futuoluo and Buddhasena pitied China for being without a true practice to take as a model. Then they spread this dharma to the eastern continent.'[100] This appears to be closest to our lineage. [778c8]

"Thus by the time of Huiguan, it had already been more than three hundred and seventy years since the teaching of the Buddha had entered China. In what had been brought over, the magnificent sūtras and the great commentaries were now complete. How could [China] rely on one *Bujingguan jing* as its model? What he said was [that China was] 'without true practice to take as a model.'[101] It was precisely because China had not yet begun to truly possess the hidden dharma of the ultimate realization that students of the teaching were to take it as a model." [778c12]

[The visitor] said, "Why do you say that the *Meditation Sūtra* has a subtle meaning that accords with our true lineage?"

[99] T.55.2145.66c5–6 with some skipping of characters and variant characters.
[100] T.55.2145.67a2–4.
[101] T.55.2145.67a3–4.

[I] said, "The *Meditation Sūtra* says, 'The Buddha declared, whoever wishes to seek abhi-samaya 阿鼻三摩耶[102] *The original interlinear note says that this is the name of an awakening*. should perform *damo monasiqieluo* 達磨摩那斯伽羅 [dharma manaskara?].[103] If one constantly contemplates the true meaning, one may cut away the skanda thieves with the sword of sagely behavior. Be not like an inferior man who cannot avenge himself on his enemy and is instead hurt by him. Even in the case of all the worthies and sages, all the right contemplations of this nature must be cultivated assiduously. They do this for the purpose of manifesting joy in the dharma, of creating great illumination for later generations, of cutting off all the roots of suffering, of benefitting the multitude of beings. [If this is difficult for those who have practiced zealously,] how much more so is it for an ordinary man who has accomplished nothing and simply indulges himself and does not practice zealously?'[104] Below it explains, '"Dharma" means the best teaching in the world. 'Manaskara' means the core of the single scripture. The meaning of the translator is ' thought' (*siwei* 思惟).'[105] [778c21]

"The *Meditation Sūtra* is two fascicles. From beginning to end, it is all in Chinese. Only for this awakening, the best teaching in the world, and the core of the single scripture is Sanskrit used. They keep them secret by not translating then. In this way, our scholiasts contained the subtle meaning of the Buddha. They particularly wanted [people] to awaken and cross over by means of the secret. They hope people will think about the truth by means of this. For this reason, it next gives the command of the Buddha, 'Constantly contemplate the true meaning.'[106] As for the saying 'cutting away the skanda thieves with the sword of sagely behavior,'[107] the *[Da] zhidu lun* [大]智度論, says 'As for the sword of the sixteen sagely behaviors, its meaning is no different than the three gates of liberation.'[108] These three gates of liberation are

---

[102] In the abhidharma school, an awakening based on contemplation of the four noble truths (Mochizuki, v. 1, 336).

[103] An unidentified term. The explanation given by the *Meditation Sūtra* itself—quoted below—does not clarify matters.

[104] T.15.618.321c3–8. The preceding lines describe the five skandas as malevolent thieves who stalk people.

[105] T.15.618.321c9–11.

[106] T.15.618.321c4.

[107] T.15.618.321c4.

[108] T.25.1509.197a21. See Lamotte, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, v. 2, 1112.

common to both the Mahāyāna and the Hīnayāna. Only in what they rely upon are they superior and inferior. The three gates of liberation of the Mahāyāna are what rely upon the true form of all the dharmas. The Hīnayāna is different from this. [778c29]

"Now this surely relies upon the true meaning, and with the sword of sagely behavior, one may examine what is contemplated. Indeed, it is the marvelous secret dharma of the Mahāyāna. The final verse of the 'Shengdao jueding' 勝道決定 [Resolution to triumph on the path] section of this scripture says, 'The Buddha, using but a small portion of his wisdom/explained briefly the nature of all the dharmas. Perfect meaning like this/is the object of the ten powers and wisdoms.'[109] A verse at the end of the second fascicle says, 'Expedient means govern the practice of the stages/to arrive at perfection. The contributor of the unsurpassed dharma/bestows it, passing it on to the present.'[110] The conclusion also says, 'Only those who have already crossed over/later attain perfection.'[111] How can this not be called the place of perfection? It is the subtle secret mind of the Buddha which is indescribable. Only by means of awakening can one be in accord [with the Buddha mind]. This is in accord with our lineage. [779a9]

"Formerly, at the time of the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra*, all the bhikṣus were listening to the Buddha's explanation of separation from the four bad views.[112] Then they asked the Buddha to remain long in the world in order to teach and guide them. The Tathāgata, to correct their idea, said, 'The unsurpassed true dharma I now possess has all already been entrusted to Mahākāśyapa. Mahākāśyapa will be for you and others a great support.' In this way the Tathāgata produced a support for all beings.[113] The *Da zhidu lun* says, 'When the Buddha was about to enter nirvāṇa, at the time when he laid down with his head to the north, he first told Ānanda, 'Before my present manifestation and after I die, it is right that the bhikṣus rely upon the dharma.'[114] Those who rely on

---

[109] T.15.618.314b9–10. The Taishō edition of the *Meditation Sūtra* notes that the palace edition has *fang* 方 for *li* 力, which would make this "wisdom of the ten directions."

[110] T.15.618.325b1–2.

[111] T.15.618.325b8.

[112] The four *dao* 四倒 are belief in eternity, pleasure, purity, and self (Nakamura, *Bukkyōgo daijiten*, 528).

[113] Summary of T.12.375.617b17–28.

[114] Selected from T.25.1509.66b22–24, c4–5. See Lamotte, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, v. 1, 84, 85. Qisong does not read this last line as a tripartate statement.

the dharma are said to 'contemplate their bodies mentally and always concentrate their minds with wisdom, zeal, and vigor, etc.'[115] Thus [the Buddha] taught that one ought not to rely on others.[116] Next the *Da zhidu lun* says to take the vinaya and sūtras as one's teacher.[117] Then it discusses the matter of [Mahākāśyapa's] collecting the treasures of the dharma.[118] *After nirvāṇa was the division of the sūtras.*[119] Then [Mahākāśyapa] entered nirvāṇa. [779a18]

"The so-called 'unsurpassed true dharma' [mentioned in the *Meditation Sūtra* verse quoted earlier] refers directly to the nature of the dharmas verified by the Tathāgata. He had already entrusted it to Mahākāśyapa. Those who want to study the dharma can rely on this as the standard for rectifying themselves. Thus if one wishes to carry out in later generations the dharma of his lord [i.e., the Buddha] but has not been entrusted with the seal of the dharma to uphold it, upon what is he to base himself? Now it is said that the dharma was already entrusted to Mahākāśyapa. Does this not make one take the dharma to rectify oneself? The true seal verifies that [one ought to] cultivate realization in accordance with the teachings. [779a23]

"Another scripture [the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra*] says, 'Four [kinds of] people appear in the world to protect and uphold the dharma. [We] should verify and know this and then rely upon it. These people understand well the secret, mysterious treasury of the Tathāgata.'[120] It also says, 'These people can understand the secret language of the Tathāgata and can explain it.'[121] How could this not be so? The meaning of the *Da zhidu lun* [passage quoted] earlier about relying on the dharma and [the above statement about] the four supports are close. [779a27]

Instead, he breaks it into half, reading (and quoting) it as "oneself relying on the dharma" rather than "rely on one self, rely on the dharma."

[115] T.25.1509.66c6–7. See Lamotte, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, v. 1, 85.

[116] T.25.1509.66c5. Qisong's understanding of dharma transmission allows him to view the dharma-heirs as identical to the dharma. Therefore relying on them is relying on the dharma, not relying on others.

[117] T.25.1509.66c10.

[118] T.25.1509.66c13–14ff.

[119] Despite the term "sūtra," this is probably a reference to the division of the teachings into sūtra, śāstra, and vinaya.

[120] T.12.375.642a29–b2, with a rhetorical "why?" left out after the second sentence. This section of the sūtra begins with a long passage on the four kinds of people who can protect, build, and remember the true dharma and benefit sentient beings (637a–c).

[121] T.12.375.642b4–5. An answer to the question, "Why are these four [kinds of] people called 'Tathāgata'?"

"The *Meditation Sūtra* says that Mahākāśyapa inherited from our Buddha. After the death of the Buddha, this was passed down one by one.[122] Surely [this prophecy] has been fulfilled. Huiyuan says, '[Ānanda] received the principle of the teaching completely.'[123] Is this far from that which is called 'secret language' [in the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra* quotation above]? If scholars understand this with their minds, the deep essence of the unsurpassed true dharma that he entrusted can be sought. The matter is surely the same as [what is found in] another fascicle of the scripture about the entrusting of the dharma to the king and minister and four-fold assembly, but the meaning is different.[124] Furthermore, in the 'Zhulei' 囑累 [Entrusting] section of the *Da zhidu lun*, it is asked, 'Is there any other dharma that is so profound, more profound even than prajñā, so that you entrusted prajñā to Ānanda while other scriptures were entrusted to bodhisattvas? *Earlier in this commentary, it says that these other scriptures were the* Lotus Sūtra *and all the scriptures of other methods and that they were entrusted to Xiwang* 喜王 *and all the bodhisattvas.*[125] The reply is that the *Prajñāpāramitā* [*Sūtra*] is not a secret teaching. *Does this not mean that the secret teaching surpasses prajñā? This demonstrates that Nāgārjuna must have separately transmitted some secret teachings apart from the sūtras.*[126] *How can it be discussed in the scriptures? After I presented the record* [i.e., the *Chuanfa zhengzong ji*] *to the throne, I saw this subtle meaning. I do not dare change the words already presented to the throne. Here I point out this fact in addition, in the hope that scholars will be aware of it.* As the *Lotus Sūtra* and other scriptures preach, the arhats received prophesies of becoming Buddhas. The great bodhisattvas are able to receive and use [this information]. It is like the great medicine master who can use poison as medicine.'[127] The *[Da*

[122] Reference to T.15.618.301c6–10.

[123] T.55.2145.65c5.

[124] Reference to T.12.375.621a10–11 in which the Buddha entrusts the dharma to the king, his minister, and the fourfold assembly in the context of protecting it from those who violate the precepts and harm the dharma.

[125] T.25.1509.754b13–14. A *Xiwang pusa* 喜王菩薩 appears in a long list of bodhisattvas in the *Shizhu biposha lun* 十住毘婆沙論 (T.26.1521.44c–45a), a work also attributed to Nāgārjuna and translated by Kumārajīva. Why this bodhisattva is singled out here is not clear.

[126] Reading *ci* 此 for *bi* 比.

[127] T.25.1509.754b18–22. The preceding passage includes a question about how Ānanda, a mere śrāvaka, could have received the prajñāpāramitā teaching rather than the great bodhisattvas.

zhidu] lun honors the greatness of the *Prajñā* [*pāramitā Sūtra*] saying, 'The *Mahāprajñā pāramitā sūtra* is the greatest of all the sūtras.'[128] It also says, 'The prajñāpāramitā is called the mother of all the Buddhas of the three times. It can show the true sign of all dharmas.'[129] It also says, 'The true sign of all dharmas is thus prajñā pāramitā.'[130] It also says, 'All dharma[-appearances?] except for the true form of the dharmas are called Māra.'[131] The *Nirvāṇa Sūtra* says, 'The great prajñā is the complete secret treasury.'[132] [779b15]

"After entrusting all the scriptures to śrāvakas and bodhisattvas, the Buddha made a point of saying, 'The *Prajñāpāramitā [Sūtra]* is not a secret teaching.'[133] Did not Nāgārjuna *The character* ben 本 *avoids the imperial name; below I follow this example.*[134] inherit from Mahākāśyapa and Ānanda to be a great patriarch of the transmission of the dharma and thus outside the scriptures also truly attain its true form? [He] wished to take this opportunity to expound upon it somewhat. Otherwise, how could he believe that the great prajñā is not a secret teaching? As I examined his analogy that poison can be medicine, I became increasingly aware of some subtle points in this. At any rate, it is not easy to come to conclusions about it by means of teachings and schools. *His commentary also says, to cure with the subtle, mysterious, illusionary dharma is like having one poison that can cure many poisons.*[135] *Ancient worthies also say that the four teachings are all this adjusting artfully to change things. And it cites the scripture saying that an empty fist deludes small children. To verify this, one can seek the meaning of poison serving as medicine.*[136] [779b22]

---

[128] T.25.1509.84b18–19.

[129] T.25.1509.93a7–8. See Lamotte, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, v. 1, 298.

[130] T.25.1509.375b14, with a slight change in the text.

[131] T.25.1509.99b19–20. In Qisong's quotation, the character xiang 相, meaning "mark," appears in the second phrase. See Lamotte, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, v. 1, 340.

[132] T.12.375.627b11–12.

[133] T.25.1509.754b20.

[134] Qisong refers to the substitution of *ben* 本 for *shu* 樹 in Nāgārjuna's name, taboo during the Northern Qi 北齊 because of its appearance in the personal name of the grandfather of the founder of the dynasty. This is not one of the usual substitutions (Wang Yankun , *Lidai bihuizi hidian*, 413–14).

[135] Possibly a reference to T.25.1509.754b22, which describes a doctor making medicine out of poison.

[136] The simile of the empty fist deluding a child does appear in the *Da zhidu lun* (T.25.1509.375a14–15), but this text is not a scripture, nor is the passage quoting one.

"As the preface of Huiyuan says, 'Ānanda inherited completely the principle of the teaching. When encountering people who were not [fit to receive the teaching], [Ānanda] had to hide it in his mind.'[137] It also says, 'Their attainments were beyond words, not discussed in the scriptures.'[138] This is Nāgārjuna's meaning." [779b26]

[The visitor] said, "Before you said that to entrust something to Mahākāśyapa at the time of nirvāṇa was to transmit the secret dharma to him. Is this not the same as entrusting [the dharma] to Ānanda. Why did [he] not say both these things at the time of nirvāṇa?"

[I] said, "Ānanda was next among disciples and also specially transmitted the scriptures and commentaries of the Buddha. If [the Buddha] had leapt forward in the order [of the disciples] and openly named Ānanda, then that would be tantamount to unjustly transmitting something besides the scriptures. Directing [the transmission] to Mahākāśyapa, [the Buddha] abided by the law that one entrusts to the eldest. This in turn honors the secret transmission of mind. Although he transmitted it to Ānanda, this was surely 'known without being spoken of.'[139] The *[Jingde] chuandeng lu* says, '[The Buddha] jointly ordered Ānanda to assist in spreading [the teaching].'[140] How could [he] not have specially left it to Mahākāśyapa? What the *[Nirvāṇa] Sūtra*, the *Da [zhidu] lun* and the *Meditation Sūtra* say is that after the nirvāṇa of the Buddha, the honored one Mahākāśyapa and the honored one Ānanda down to the honored one Buruomiduoluo all upheld the dharma. This lamp of wisdom was passed down in succession. Furthermore, as the two prefaces of Huiyuan and Huiguan say, 'Ānanda received the principle of the teaching completely and had to hide it in his mind. He encountered a person who was [fit to receive the teaching] and then later transmitted it.'[141] Surely this is also the same. [779c9]

"Now with the stories of these five [*Da zhidu lun*, *Meditation Sūtra*, the two prefaces, the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra*], [we can] verify the *Baolin [zhuan]* and *[Jingde] Chuandeng [lu]*, which say that when the Tathāgata was about to die, he commanded Mahākāśyapa, saying, 'I now pass to you

[137] T.55.2145.65c5–6.

[138] T.55.2145.65c11–12.

[139] This phrase *cun er buyan* 存而不言 strongly echoes *cun er bulun* 存而不論, a phrase in the *Zhuangzi*.

[140] T.51.2076.205b28–29.

[141] T.55.2145.65c5–6. The phrases are out of order, with first phrase only at T.55.2145.66c5–6.

the pure eye of dharma, the subtle heart of nirvāṇa, the non-mark of true marks, the marvelous true dharma. You should protect and uphold [it]. I jointly order Ānanda to assist in spreading it and not letting it be cut off.'[142] The *[Tiansheng] Guangdeng lu* recently compiled by Duke Li Zunxu says that Mahākāśyapa spoke to Ānanda, saying, 'When the Bhagavan had not yet entered parinirvāṇa, in front of the stupa of Duozi 多子, he secretly transmitted to me the treasury of the eye of the true dharma. I now transmit [it] to you.'[143] From beginning to end, what is different? That which has always been called beyond words and scriptures [is] this separate transmission of the true dharma. Is it not clear?" [779c17]

The visitor said, "What you infer is detailed. However, what appears in the *Meditation Sūtra* is only the thirty-seven items and the four contemplations.[144] All of these are the ways and marks of the Hīnayāna. Yet you say it comes from Bodhidharma. How can this be right? I am very doubtful about it. What of this?"

I said, "The thirty-seven items and four contemplations are surely common to both the Mahāyāna and the Hīnayāna. Now listen well. According to the *Da zhidu lun*, 'The Buddha said [the thirty-seven items] from the four contemplations to the noble eightfold path are in the Mahāyāna. Neither is it said in the tripitaka that the thirty-seven items are only the dharma of the Hīnayāna.'[145] It also says, 'In the six pāramitās and the thirty-seven paths of the dharma are born all the Buddhas of the ten directions of the past, the future, and the present. For this reason, Subhuti, when bodhisattvas want to obtain complete unexcelled awakening, [purify] Buddha worlds, and perfect the multitude of beings, it is proper to study the six pāramitās and thirty-seven paths of the dharma.'[146] It also says, 'The Buddha told Subhuti, 'The bodhisattva-mahāsattvas study like this for the purpose of studying the six pāramitās and for the purpose of studying the four contemplations.

---

[142] T.51.2076.205b27–28.

[143] XZJ 135.612a–b.

[144] The thirty-seven sections are the thirty-seven *bodhipakṣika*, methods of practical cultivation used by the bodhisattva. The four places of thought, or *catvari smrty-upasthanani*, are included in the thirty-seven. They consist of contemplation on the impurity of the body, suffering, the impermanence of the mind, and the lack of inherent essence of dharmas (Nakamura, *Bukkyōgo daijiten*, 472, 528–529).

[145] Almost exactly T.25.1509.197b26–c2. See Lamotte, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, v. 3, 1139.

[146] T.25.1509.597a6–10, dropping one character.

Studying like this is studying completely all paths of study. Studying like this is for the purpose of studying the conduct of the Buddha. Studying like this is for opening the gate of sweet dew. Studying like this is for showing the nature of non-being. Subhuti, inferior people cannot study this."[147] The meaning of the Buddha is like this. Who says the thirty-seven items and four contemplations are only the ways and marks of the Hīnayāna? [780a3]

"Now Bodhidharma, as a great bodhisattva-monk, transmitted the dharma as a patriarch. He preached the *Meditation Sūtra* to circulate the Mahāyāna dharma. Indeed, this was proper. How can anyone doubt it? Even if the four contemplations belong only to the path of the Hīnayāna, the *Da zhidu lun* also says, 'Subhuti, in this way, a bodhisattva studies all the dharmas and internally achieves purity; this is the mind of the śrāvaka and the pratyekabuddha.'[148] It also says, 'A bodhisattva in this way understands the tendencies of the minds of all beings.'[149] It also says, 'The thirty-seven items are the śrāvaka and pratyekabuddha's path to nirvāṇa.'[150] The Buddha urges the bodhisattva to follow this path. In this way, then, the bodhisattva also achieves the dharma of the śrāvaka and advances human understanding. [780a11]

"Now the *Meditation Sūtra* expounds upon it. Is this not following the intention of the Buddha? Why is it not justified? Furthermore, it does not treat people with the Hīnayāna at all. In the *Meditation Sūtra*, the patriarchal master Bodhidharma first, with expedient means, teaches the practices of the three vehicles. He does this because of the shallowness [of some people's understanding] and then guides them to depth. His scripture says, 'The object of the Tathāgata is beyond comprehension.'[151] This is an example. In his preface, Huiyuan says, '[Dharmatrāta and Buddhasena] gathered the essence of sūtras in order to promote the Mahāyāna.'[152] The discussion there is detailed." [780a16]

[The visitor] said, "If that is so, then the *Meditation Sūtra* lists from the beginning the patriarchs who transmitted the dharma. How

---

[147] Selected lines from T.25.1509.604c22–23, 25–26, 26 and 605a2–4.
[148] T.25.1509.605a13–15, dropping one character.
[149] T.25.1509.605a22–23 condensed, dropping one character.
[150] Combining T.25.1509.197b16–17 and c2–3.
[151] T.15.618.324b24.
[152] T.55.2145.66a12, with a variant character but the same meaning.

could all the patriarchs of old have also transmitted the scriptures and teachings?"

[I] said, "That is correct. In the past, the dharma was transmitted in order to verify the practice and teaching. It teaches how to enter the path. This must be what the patriarchs transmit as the seal of truth. The *Chanyuan [zhu]quan [jidu xu]* 禪源[註]詮[集都序] says that the patriarchs who transmitted the dharma first practiced the tripiṭaka and the vehicle of teaching. The patriarchal masters of later generations observed [people's varying] faculties and made a special effort to promote their school and eliminate people's attachment. Then they further transmitted the mind seal alone."[153] [780a21]

The visitor said, "I have also heard Prajñātāra only transmitted to Bodhidharma the great dharma-medicine and commanded him to deal directly with people of superior faculties. [This method is] outside scriptures and teachings, not depending on words, pointing directly at the human mind, achieving complete awakening. I have not heard that he also followed the ways and signs of the Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna for the sake of his preaching."

I said, "Of course, the transmission from Prajñātāra to Bodhidharma is in fact the true transmission of the Buddha and patriarchs. However, scholars must also search for the whole story of former sages transmitting [the dharma] and investigate the intent in the circumstances under which they carried out the transformation. They should not simply hold to the words of one time and debate with each other. As for [the words] 'with the medicine of the great dharma, deal directly with those of superior faculties, not depending on words, pointing directly at the human mind, achieving complete awakening,' it must be Prajñātāra first exhorting Bodhidharma that when traveling from place to place, he should carefully observe [people's varying] facilities in order to carry out the teaching that had been rightly transmitted to him. This means that sixty-seven years after his death *after the death of Prajñātrata* China produced a person of superior facilities, and as determined by karma, Bodhidharma met him. At that time, he had to use widely the medicine of the great dharma to deal directly with people with such facilities. [780b4]

"For over a hundred years before Bodhidharma entered the country, the *Meditation Sūtra* was limited to the western regions because the

[153] Summary of T.48.2015.400b10–26. See Broughton, *Zongmi on Chan*, 109.

time for the true transmission had not come and those of superior facilities were few. Thus, in accordance with people's varying facilities and the expedient means required, [Buddhist masters] had to rely on either the Mahāyāna or the Hīnayāna to expound the teaching provisionally. *The* Baolin zhuan *also says that Bodhidharma was first in southern India converting some people with the dharma of the* Hīnayāna.[154] Bodhidharma once did this, too. As it is said, bodhisattvas exhaust all the paths of study to understand the inclinations of the minds of all beings.[155] [780b9]

"However, the way of the patriarchal masters does not stop with this. As for the saying 'not depending upon words, pointing directly at the human mind, dealing directly wit those of superior facilities,' the *Meditation Sūtra* already implies it but it had not yet been uncovered. When the time came, Bodhidharma made up his mind to come east. He took advantage of [the fact that] China possessed the spirit of the Mahāyāna. Therefore, what he rightly transmitted began to prosper widely in the time of Liang and Wei. Scholars little realize. They only see that [the *Meditation Sūtra*] uses words to preach the calming and contemplation of the three vehicles and say therefore they are not the words of Bodhidharma. How reckless they are! [780b15]

"In the concluding verses of the 'Sheng[dao] jueding' section, the *Meditation Sūtra* says, 'The Buddha using but a small portion of his wisdom/explained briefly the nature of all the dharmas. Perfect meaning like this/is the object of the ten powers and wisdoms.'[156] This might have been a modest expression of the patriarch. His meaning is this: this scripture is merely my general provisional explanation of this. As for the ultimate principle, it is the spiritual state of the Buddha, secret and subtle, inexpressible by words and explanations. It must be reached by the secret transmitted marvelous awakening alone. Furthermore, the final verse of the scripture says, 'Expedient means govern the practice of the stages/to arrive at perfection. The contributor to the unsurpassed dharma/bestows it, passing it on to the present.'[157] This concluding sentence also says, 'Only those who have already crossed over/later attain perfection.'[158] When it says, 'expedient means

[154] Probably from the missing seventh juan.
[155] T.25.1509.605a22–23, condensed, dropping one character.
[156] T.15.618.314b9–10.
[157] T.15.618.325b1–2.
[158] T.15.618.325b8, with one differing character.

govern the practice of the stages,' this is meant to expound, with some teachings, the *Meditation Sūtra*. When it says, 'arriving at perfection,' it refers to rightly transmitting the great dharma [by] dealing directly with those of superior facilities. When it says, 'The contributor to the unsurpassed dharma/bestows it, passing it on to the present,' this refers to what Bodhidharma himself said about inheriting what the Buddha transmitted, and it continues to the present day. When it says, 'Only those who have already crossed over/later attain perfection,' this refers to the dharma being secret, wordless, markless, hard to believe, and hard to achieve. Only with what one has awakened to can one comprehend the perfection. [780b29]

"How could the meaning not be outside the scriptures and yet have its own principle? How could it not rely on words and yet await people directly verifying with their minds? Until Huiyuan inherited from a disciple of Bodhidharma, it was transmitted secretly. Thus he wrote a preface to the *Meditation Sūtra*, saying, 'Ānanda inherited the principle of the teaching completely. When encountering people who were not [fit to receive the teaching], [Ānanda] had to hide it in the numinous mansion [of his mind]'[159] It also says, 'Their attainments were beyond words, not discussed in the scriptures.'[160] It also says, 'In the case of such a person, nothing is seen or heard of him. It is clear that there is a separate teaching.'[161] In this way, how could what Huiyuan obtained be found within scriptures, teachings, language and words? Alas, since our scholarship is superficial, and few are knowledgeable, how could it be known that the ancient worthies first transmitted this *Meditation Sūtra* as advance preparation for the true line of Bodhidharma? In this we gain clear proof of the decline of our lineage." [780c8]

[The visitor] said, "A master of another lineage has the name of Dharmatrāta. Now you say that Dharmatrāta is the Bodhidharma of the Chan school. How can this be proven?"

[I] said, "My earlier discussion verifying the twenty-eight patriarchs in the *Meditation Sūtra* is already detailed. Furthermore, Huiyuan's preface says, 'Dharmatrāta was a leading talent of the western regions, a model of Chan teaching.'[162] If this is not the patriarch and master

[159] T.55.2145.65c5–6.
[160] T.55.2145.65c11–12.
[161] Selected from T.55.2145.65c26–28.
[162] Correcting an apparent copyist's mistake of *da* 達 for *yuan* 遠. T.55.2145.66a11–12, dropping Buddhasena from the line.

of our lineage, then who is he? How could the master, who shares the same name but belongs to different schools participate in this status? Now those who brought out the *Meditation Sūtra* were Buddhabhadra and Huiyuan, and Huiguan also participated. These three people all say it contains the complete and sudden meaning of the Mahāyāna. How can what they say be in error? [780c15]

"Huiyuan, from antiquity to the present, has everywhere been referred to [in the phrase] 'Daoan 道安 and Huiyuan.'[163] The great flourishing of our Buddhist teaching in China begins with these two venerables. They were especially great dharma masters. I once said that the knowledge of Huiyuan was loftiest and his open-mindedness the most vast. For a son of the Buddha [i.e., a monk], he had literary ability and substance.[164] He set an example for the sangha, and his demeanor and virtues were outstanding. Confucian worthies will look up to him for a hundred generations. Among the eminent monks of past and present, Huiyuan is peerless. He is a man whose measure cannot be taken.

"The honored one Buddhabhadra penetrated broadly the three treasuries and had a particularly good memory. In the western regions, he was said to understand broadly Buddhist and other works. He was called an extraordinary monk. Moreover, Sengzhao 僧肇 respected him, saying that he was 'a meditation teacher of the Mahāyāna.'[165]

"In Buddhist understanding and literary ability, Huiguan was comparable to [Dao]sheng [道]生, [Seng]zhao, [Dao]rong [道]融, and [Seng]rui [僧]叡.[166] He was also a famous dharma master of the past. And these three in this way all honor the essence of Chan so the path of Bodhidharma was perhaps the ultimate. [780c26]

"I also hear that the *[Da] zhidu lun* says, 'Dhyāna is the greatest, like a king. When one says 'dhyāna,' then all are completely included.'[167] 'All the samādhis of the Buddha and the bodhisattvas, the Buddha's

---

163 Huiyuan's teacher Daoan was a crucial figure in the establishment of Buddhism in China. See Zürcher, *Buddhist Conquest*, 180–204.

164 This description makes reference to *Analects* 6.18, where the balance of substance and refinement in writing is established as the mark of a superior man (Slingerland, *Analects*, 59).

165 T.25.1858.155b12. This praise occurs in a letter in which Sengzhao describes the situation in Chang'an.

166 Kumārajīva's four most prominent disciples.

167 T.25.1509.185b17–18. Qisong mixes up the word order of this line, which is part of the answer to the question "Why is dhyāna called a pāramitā when all sorts of other mental practices are not." Lamotte translates, "Le dhyāna occupe la première place,

attainment of the path, and his relinquishing of life—all these kinds of supreme marvelous virtues are included within dhyāna.'[168] Moreover, another fascicle [of the *Da zhidu lun*] speaks of this meaning, saying, 'Liberations, dhyānas, and samādhis are all called 'concentrations.' 'Concentration' is the name for the mind.'[169] That which is called the mind is what is transmitted by all Chan patriarchs. Those of old called the dhyāna gate the lineage gate.[170] This is also the meaning of the patriarch Nāgārjuna [to whom the *Da zhidu lun* is attributed]. It is also called 'our' lineage gate and the true inclination of the great lineage of the teaching of the Buddha Śākyamuni. It is only that what is called the meaning of the lineage gate is scattered in many sūtras. It has been hidden and covered from antiquity up to now. It has not yet begun to be manifest, seen everywhere under Heaven. Once I constantly examined this breaking-off. As for what has been seen in the great treasury since the Tathāgata entrusted the dharma and entered nirvāṇa, we can by reference to sources including Huiyuan's general preface, the *Meditation Sūtra*, the *[Da] zhidu lun*, and the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra* search for subtle principles and certify it. In the case of this great matter of the Buddhadharma, how could I, a lesser man, decide by means of personal feelings? I merely want to uncover what has been cherished by the worthies and sages of earlier generations. What will the knowledgeable think of my motives? [781a10]

"Huiyuan says, 'The flourishing of the three activities take meditation and wisdom as the main principle.'[171] Does this not say that dhyāna [lit., meditation and Chan] is the principle of the three studies of sūtra, vinaya, and śāstra? He also says, 'I constantly regretted that since the Great Teaching flowed eastward, dhyāna and the counting

---

tel un roi. Parler de dhyāna, c'est inclure tous les autres recueillements" (*Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, v. 2, 1022).

[168] Qisong condenses T.25.1509.185b 25–26 and adds bodhisattvas to this line. See Lamotte, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, v. 2, 1023.

[169] I read *hua* 化, "change," as an error for *ta* 他, "other." The quotation is of T.25.1509.238c9–10. Qisong cuts the second line into half. Lamotte translates, "Les vimoksa, dhyāna, samapattai et samādhi sont 'concentrations' et par concentration [on entend la non-distraction de] la pensée (citta-viksepa)" (*Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, v. 3, 1539).

[170] The line 禪門爲宗門 may read several different ways, given the multivalence of both *chan* and *zong*. It seems, however, that Qisong is trying to establish that the Chan tradition is the essence or core of the Buddhist tradition, and I have translated accordingly. For a helpful discussion of the term *zong* 宗, see Welter, "The Problem with Orthodoxy in Zen Buddhism."

[171] T.55.2145.65b23.

[of breath that accompanies it] were the least [of its parts], that the three activities were not unified, and that this path was almost entirely abandoned.'[172] Does this not say that precept, samādhi, and prajñā must be unified in the essence of meditation? He also says, 'Moreover, he understands the crisis well and is good at adapting to the changes of the world. Obscuring his name and covering his tracks, nothing is heard of him and he does not give instruction. In the case of such a person, it is not possible to identify by name or school. He is not one who [can be] distinguished by name or school, nor does he go beyond them. It is clear that there is a separate teaching.'[173] Does this not say that a sage understands the crisis well and adapts, understanding it, purely with secret verification and marvelous function, making the lineage of a separate teaching? Moreover, he says, '[O]f the eighty thousand dharma treasures, all that [matters and] is worthy of preservation is the essence.'[174] Does this not say that of the eighty-four thousand dharma collections of the Buddha, there is not one that that does not take this secretly transmitted ultimate awakening as the true essence? He also says, 'Many follow the branch to seek the root, while few know how to manipulate the tip by mastering the base. Some almost arrive but do not reach the destination. Some cling to their biases and do not know how to change.'[175] Does this not say that what is first is the tip and what is last is the base? How scholars make ridiculous mistakes, cling to the specific and do not know the complete transformation! [781a23]

"He also says, 'The sage intent is not merely to complete strengths but also to compensate for shortcomings.'[176] Does this not mean that the sage intent of the Buddha is not only to complete the marvelous basis of its strengths, but also to compensate fully for the very extreme of those with dim shortcomings? He also says, 'These three arhats had all, by means of their ultimate vow, established an affinity in the past. Their attainments were beyond words, not discussed in the scriptures.'[177] Does this not say that Kāśyapa, Ānanda, and Upagupta *[Ānanda] with Kāśyapa and Upagupta were explained as the three*

[172] T.55.2145.65c28–29, following the Tsukamoto/Hurvitz translation closely.
[173] T.55.2145.65c25–28 with slightly different wording.
[174] T.55.2145.65c13–14.
[175] T.55.2145.65c20–22. wording slightly different.
[176] T.55.2145.65c22–23.
[177] T.55.2145.65c10–12.

arhats. *This expands the meaning of their mysterious pact*. secretly received the silent transmission? They all accorded with the former marvelous, subtle mysterious mind of our Buddha and went beyond scriptural teachings. The *Meditation Sūtra* calls *manaskara* the core of the single scripture.[178] It is secret and thus not translated. Below it says, 'Even in the case of all the worthies and sages, all the right contemplations of this nature must be cultivated assiduously.'[179] Does this not say that those people who participate in the teaching must work hard at this secret ultimate awakening and only then attain the correct view? [781b4]

"The *Nirvāṇa Sūtra* says, 'All the unsurpassed true dharma I have today I entrust to Mahākāśyapa. This Mahākāśyapa can be for all of you a great support.'[180] Does this not say that now and later all can rely upon Mahākāśyapa['s] unsurpassed marvelous subtle dharma and regard it as correct? It also says, 'Four people appear in the world to protect and uphold the dharma. [We] should verify and know this and then rely upon it. The four are called the Tathāgata. Why is this? It is because [they] can understand the secret language of the Tathāgata and can explain it.'[181] Does this not say that throughout the ages, men of the four supports will appear in the world and take these secret words of the marvelous mind as clear proof for later [generations]? [781b11]

"The *[Da] zhidu lun* says, 'Prajñāpāramitā is not the secret dharma.'[182] This point is also made clear in the *Chan [jing]*. Let me just omit it, without any further explanation. In investigating this, could we not find that the great sage originally meant to take the wondrous, mysterious and pure Chan as the principle of his teaching? Was it not that he wished every generation of the students of the three sections of Buddhism to rely upon it as the verifying standard for entering the way? Those of old called our dhyāna gate a principle gate, but this

[178] T.15.618.321c10.
[179] T.15.618.321c5–6.
[180] T.12.375.617b25–27, with a slight difference in wording that does not affect the meaning.
[181] T.12.375.642a29–b1, b3–5. This section of the sūtra begins with a long passage on the four kinds of people who can protect, build, and remember the true dharma and benefit sentient beings (637a–c). The preceding passage defines the four supports as relying on the dharma, not other people, relying on the meaning, not the language, relying on wisdom, not knowledge, and relying on understanding of scripture, rather than relying on non-understanding of scripture.
[182] T.25.1509.754b20.

is honoring the external characteristics of the traces of the teaching. However, this essence of Chan is the principle of our single Buddhist teaching and the thirty-three patriarchs from Mahākāśyapa to Caoqi 曹溪 [i.e., Huineng] who transmitted the essentials of the dharma are all the patriarchs of the teachings of Śākyamuni. But those of shallow knowledge falsely separate Bodhidharma and Caoqi as just the patriarchs of the Chan gate. Is this not also much mistaken? [781b21]

"Surely nothing is outside the path. The dharma and words are never different. Which is external and [which] internal? As for the saying, 'temporarily forgetting the different dialects [used by the Buddha to preach the dharma], the different versions [of Buddhist texts] and the twelve sections [of the Buddhist canon],' it means establishing directly persons of mind and nature. This is probably holding up the root to correct its traces, and distinguishing what is close in order to separate [it from] what is remote. This is to cause them to reach this ultimate awakening, no longer befuddled by a distorted view. However, it is not easy to clarify this by discussion, and it is not possible to reach this by discursive understanding. The *[Da fangguang] Yuanjue [xiuduoluo liaoyi jing]* 大方廣圓覺修多羅了義經 says, 'As for the state attained perfectly by all the śrāvakas, body, mind, words, and speech all are cut off and destroyed. In the end, [they] cannot reach the nirvāṇa shown by this intimate realization.'[183] How could it not be so? Formerly, Aśvaghoṣa said [in the *Dacheng qixin lun* 大乘起信論], '[It is] the only with awakening that one can be in accord with the state.'[184] For this reason, Nāgārjuna says, 'What cannot be explained is the truth; what can be explained is all names and words.'[185] According to this, these two patriarchs also regard highly the secrecy of the mind-awakening and distinguish themselves from those who seek detachment from their desires by hiding their traces [in mountains, etc.] They wanted people to base themselves on that [mind-awakening] and rectify themselves. [781c2]

"Zhizhe 智者 of the Sui [i.e., Tiantai Zhiyi] says that the Tathāgata once ordered each of the disciples to describe the words with which Vimalakīrti had scolded them in the past, and then the Buddha corrected them with the seal of silence.[186] Surely this is the same as the clear

---

[183] T.17.842.915c22–23.
[184] T.32.1666.576b7. Translation according to Hakeda, *Awakening of Faith*, 36.
[185] T.25.1509.319a21–22.
[186] Unidentified reference.

name[d][Vimalakīrti imparting] the seal of silence to the thirty-two bodhisattvas of the sagely preaching of the dharma. According to this then, the fact that the great sage left the subtle teaching silently achieved by his true lineage to later generations as their certifying standard had become apparent even in the time of the Buddha. Scholars can also respect and believe this. Alas, of the vinaya, dhyāna, and wisdom cultivated by the generation of bhikṣus today, what is not related to the teachings delivered by Śākyamuni? Of the sūtras, vinaya, and śāstras they are learning, which is not related to the eighty-four thousand dharma-collections? However, they cling to the teachings transmitted by their teachers and defend what they have learned.[187] They do not concern themselves with the essence of the dharma, and they do not carefully seek the true disposition of the great lineage. On the contrary, [they] neglect what was transmitted by the patriarch Bodhidharma. [They] say, 'It does not compare to the path of our master.' They not only violate the purpose of the Buddha but are also ignorant of the basis of the path. What a pity! [781c14]

"Now all that which is shown by Chan [monks], no matter whether it is words, silence or action, is the marvelous function of the first Buddha. It is only that we cannot see it. Although its source exists, I spare myself trouble and do not disseminate it again. However, perhaps this is the intention of the sage. Only by being trusted to our secretly transmitted lineage can this wondrous function be uncovered and promoted. Why? It is because they fit each other well. Otherwise, how is it that from the patriarch Bodhidharma on, this trend has been flourishing so widely? The [*Daode*] *jing* says, 'Straightforward works seem paradoxical.'[188] Who believes in these words? The patriarch Nāgārjuna once revealed in his great treatise [the *Da zhidu lun*], 'Holding up the precepts is skin. Dhyāna and samādhi are the flesh. Prajñā is the bone. The subtle marvelous good mind is the marrow.'[189] The subtle marvelous mind is that inherited from the Buddha and handed on secretly. The patriarch Bodhidharma graded the depth of what his disciples had realized. He quoted [the *Da zhidu lun*] specially, saying, 'You achieved my skin. [You] achieved my flesh. [You] achieved my

[187] Reminiscent of Ouyang Xiu's famous essay on factions, written in 1044. See Liu, *Ouyang Hsiu*, 52–64.
[188] D.C. Lau, *Tao te ching*, 78.
[189] T.25.1509.164b29–c1, with the meaning altered by the absence of three characters. See Lamotte, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, v. 2, 867.

bone. You achieved my marrow.'[190] This then is further proof of the mind-seal of the Buddha. He does not speak of precepts, samādhi, prajñā, the marvelous mind and their meanings in the dialogue. For this reason, the details of the story are omitted here, preserving only its subtle point.[781c25]

"Almost one hundred years after him, the Sui meditation master Zhiyi expounded on the sūtra and further analyzed the theory of these four. When [he] gets to 'the subtle marvelous good mind [being] the marrow,' he says it is 'the state reached by all the Buddhas, where the path of words and language is cut off, and mental movement ceases. This is the subtle marvelous middle path that is neither single nor dual.'[191] This then is the path of Nāgārjuna and Bodhidharma. Discussed by Zhizhe, it has become increasingly respected and clear. [782a1]

"The subtlety and secrecy of this mind is truly inconceivable. It is neither words nor silence. It is comprehension that comprehension does not reach [It is not accessible to discursive understanding] unreached by knowledge. When young, I once heard a little from my first good friend [*shanzhishi* 善知識, *kalyāṇa-mitra*]. He said, 'Daoyu 道育 said, 'The four great bases are originally empty; the five skandhas have no existence. My view is that not even a single dharma can be grasped.'[192] 'The path of words and language is cut off; mental movement ceases.'[193] So Bodhidharma said, 'You have obtained my bones.'[194] Then the second patriarch [Huike] bowed, returned to his position, and stood. [Bodhidharma] then said, 'You have obtained my marrow.'[195] Very good! Excellent are the words of the patriarchs. That is why [they became the patriarchs] of the school that has been transmitted. [782a8]

"The Tang monk Shenqing ridiculed Chan monks, saying, 'Some of these worthies and sages of the transmission of the dharma were śrāvakas like Mahākāśyapa. Although they made up their minds [i.e., committed themselves], it is still lesser knowledge. How could they

---

190 Selective quotation from *Jingde chuandeng lu*, T.51.2076.219c1–5.

191 *Jinguangming jing wenju*. T.39.1785.55c14–15, with the phrases in a different order.

192 A reference to the *Jingde chandeng lu*. T.51.2076.219c3–4. Only part of Daoyu's response is quoted; Daoyu was a disciple of Bodhidharma.

193 T.39.1785.55c15.

194 T.51.2076.219c4.

195 T.51.2076.219c5.

transmit the seal of the Buddha-mind?'[196] How could [Shen]qing have been so unthinking! The *Nirvāṇa Sūtra* says, 'I today entrust to Mahākāśyapa all the unsurpassable true dharma.'[197] If it is as [Shen] qing says, then the great sage transmitted this dharma falsely. This I already refuted in detail in my [*Chuanfa zhengzong*] *ji*. I will not repeat much. In examining Shenqing's shallow errors, [I see his scholarship] does not compare to the vastness of the boundaries of the knowledgeable. Why does the world call Shenqing a good scholar? If one studies in order to seek the great path, the road passes through every place under heaven. He got muddled in learning and lost the way; he got muddled about the road and did not know how to return [to the way]. His studies and road also are disasters. For this reason, the man who arrived [i.e., the Buddha] did not value much study and did not wish there to be much divergence. Those who study later are inferior. Some of them judge wrongly what the patriarch Bodhidharma called 'obtaining my marrow.' How could they profane the explanation of the knowledgeable?" [782a18]

Part Four

The visitor asked, "The teaching carries the path. How can it be external teaching and yet transmit the path? Furthermore, I have heard that in the complete sudden teaching, teaching and realization are one. Now if teaching and the path are not the same, how can this be the round [teaching]?"

[I] said, "You have not understood with your mind. Listen well. When it was said in the past that teaching and realization are one, this just means that both the principle of emptiness and correct principle are penetrated in the nature of words and letters. This is not to say that appearance of sounds and words in yellow rolls and red scrolls is directly one with true form and formlessness. As for the teaching of the twelve parts [i.e., Buddhist literature], the great sage responded skillfully to people's [varying] abilities to give the teaching, and to lay a foundation, he used worldly names and words to uncover the truth in order to trigger people's awakening. Therefore, the truth is marvelous and not what is taught. Although one speaks, in the end the words do not reach the ultimate. The so-called 'separate transmission outside

[196] T.52.2113.611b24–26.
[197] T.12.375.617b25–6.

the teaching' is not as a result different than the Buddha's teaching. It corrects that which the traces of his teachings do not reach. As the *Da [zhidu] lun* says, words are like words, but the dark import is a hidden depth. The deeper one goes in search of it, the farther he deviates from it.[198] This is the expression. [782b2]

"In the past, the Sui [monk] Zhiyi was the one who understood the teachings the most. Did he not say that the ultimate principle of the Buddhist teaching cannot be conveyed by words?[199] How can it be preserved in words and dialects like the twelve parts [i.e., Buddhist literature]? According to the *[Da] zhidu lun*, 'All the Buddhas cut off attachment to the dharma. They do not establish sūtras, and they also do not embellish words.'[200] If it is like this, how could the meaning of the great sage necessarily be in the teaching? The sūtra says that when I sit in the place of practice, I do not attain a single dharma. Truly, an empty fist deceives a small child in order to save all.[201] How could this not be the great sage using teaching as an expedient but not having to [rely] on it exclusively? Furthermore, the [*Yuanjue*] *Sūtra* also says, 'Cultivating the teaching of the sūtras is like a finger pointing at the moon. When you see the moon, you know what points at the ultimate is not the moon.'[202] How could this make a person cling to the traces of the teaching? [782b10]

"A sūtra says that from Deer Park to the [Hiraṇya]vatī river, for fifty years [the Buddha] did not speak one word.[203] This is surely what is called outside the teaching. However, this is the extreme of the mysterious and secret. Although it is recorded in sūtras, it is only explained. Because the sage realizes this, so [he] commands that the subtle teaching be transmitted by mind. This then is what Chan monks call the 'separate transmission outside the teachings.' In this case, can it not be said that the teaching and awakening are identical? Is it satisfactory? Is it not satisfactory?" [782b15]

---

[198] I have not found this in the text.

[199] I have not found this in his extant works.

[200] T.25.1509.436a29–b1.

[201] The simile appears in T.25.1509.375a14–15.

[202] T.17.842.917a27–28.

[203] Possibly a paraphrase of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, which makes the same claim but refers to the events of nirvāṇa and parinirvāṇa rather than to the places where they occurred (T.16.670.498c18–19, 513a7–8; T.16.671.551b22–23 (refering to all Buddhas), 576b26–27; T.16.672.608b16–17; also the *Jinguangming zuishengwang jing*, T.16.665.421c11–12).

[The visitor] said, "The twelve parts [i.e., Buddhist literature] are all the true words of the Buddha. How could they all be expedient means and in the end be dispensed with?"

[I] said, "If you awaken, you will know for yourself." [782b16]

[The visitor] said, "Among Chan worthies in the past, there were some who completely renounced the sūtras and images and did not engage in [reciting the sūtras and worshipping images]. What do you think of that?"

[I] said, "This is only destroying appearances and putting an end to mental activity. As the [*Yuanjue*] sūtra says, 'Only person of sudden awakening does not follow along with the dharma.'[204] What I earlier said is that in the beginning all the patriarchs also practiced both [what is taught in the] sūtras and [what is advocated by] Chan. Sons of the Buddha can rely on these two things and exert themselves to the utmost in practicing them. When the patriarch entered China with the true lineage, among the scholastic monks, some put aside their inclination to strive and compete. Among the learners of Buddhism, some [were taught] to point directly at their minds and were thus spared the labor of exegesis. Among learners of Buddhism, some who achieved awakening elsewhere had their understanding certified by Chan masters. There were those who exclusively by means of the true lineage attained the joy of dharma. In more than five hundred years, such people are surely innumerable. The Tathāgata left for later generations the verification of the true seal. Is it not apparent? It is wonderful that the merit of the patriarchs spread in the world. However, the true lineage is the most subtle and most secret. It can be seen only by those with 'true eyes of the way.' If one tries to understand it with his own ideas and debates fiercely, the more he engages in debate, the farther he will deviate from the truth. [782b29]

"[The *Da zhidu lun* of] Nāgārjuna says, 'If one resorts to discursive thinking, memorization and imagination, this is the net of Māra. Do not move, do not cling. This is the dharma seal.'[205] Only after one rids oneself of the discursive, divisive mind can one believe that what we transmit outside teachings is the seal of the true Buddha dharma.' " [782c3]

---

[204] T.17.842.919a26.

[205] T.25.1509.211a10–11 with one differing character. See Lamotte, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, v. 3, 1263.

[The visitor] said, "What is called the separate transmission outside teaching is not related to teaching, but you insist on taking the words of the *Nirvāṇa* [*Sūtra*] as proof. Is that right?"

[I] said, "Yes. Although its meaning is transmitted separately outside teaching, this matter must be indicated within the teaching. If it were not indicated within the Buddha's own teaching, how is it possible to indicate that the Buddha has transmitted something other than his teaching? For this reason, the Tathāgata revealed this matter in his final words, showing that he had already transmitted the marvelous mind. Who says it is not linked to the teaching? Did I not quote the *Nirvāṇa Sūtra* to this effect? [782c9]

"Huiyuan says, 'He is not one who [can be] distinguished by name or school, nor does he go beyond them. It is clear that it is a separate teaching.'[206] These words are meaningful.

[The visitor] said, "You say that it must be that the mind seal was passed down generation to generation to be proof of the true seal forever. How is it that the transmission of old arrived at Caoqi and then the patriarchate was cut off?"

[I] said, "How could the patriarchate be cut off as a result? It is only that from the time the true lineage entered China to the time it reached Caoqi, it had already been a long while. People practiced and knew this dharma very well. There were many of talent and accomplishment. The true lineage thus could be transmitted widely. Though its branches and schools were increasingly divided, they were successively passed down, each with its own patriarchs. With dharma, they identified with each other generation after generation. When did it ever cease to be a school? It is like the clans of the common folk taking names for their families so that sons and grandsons continue offerings to ancestors. It is only that this transmitted dharma, while there are branch patriarchs, does not compare to the flourishing of the true patriarchs." [782c20]

[The visitor] said, "With the teaching I can attain awakening. What need is there to regard what is transmitted by this lineage as ultimate?"

[I] said, "If you insist on being awakened to the way by means of the teaching, this is just to see the doctrines, not to see the way. The true seers of the way are those who 'probe to the root of things.' One

[206] T.55.2145.65c27–28.

probes so that one can change; one changes so that one can understand. To be good at changing and understanding is being awakened to the way. Changing to understand begins with our true lineage. If the sons of the Buddha can change and understand, then they participate in our true lineage. Why do you say 'What need is there to regard this lineage as ultimate?' You and your ilk do not yet know change. How you achieve awakening? Huiyuan said, 'Some almost arrive but do not reach the destination. Some cling to their biases and do not know how to change.'[207] This perhaps refers to you. If throughout the generations, the emperor, kings, princes, marquises, nobles, high gentleman, the sages and worthies of the Confucians keep it in mind and place respect in this lineage gate, it cannot be enumerated exhaustively. This is like our Song Emperors Taizong 太宗 [r. 976–997] and Zhenzong 真宗 [r. 997–1022] both understanding most deeply. The late Zhangsheng Emperor 章聖皇帝 [i.e., Zhenzong] composed a poem on the cultivation of the mind:

> The first patriarch sat peacefully in meditation at Shaolin.
> He did not transmit scriptures or teachings, only mind.
> When later people realize the nature of the truth,
> the secret seal comes from the depth of the marvelous principle.[208]

Up to now, the present emperor [i.e., Renzong 仁宗] himself is still mindful of Chan. He particularly takes this poem as a gāthā. Just after this gāthā was disseminated all over the world, he further began to have someone working on the chart of patriarchs who transmitted the dharma and robes. [783a6]

"The [*Jiu*] *Tang shu* says, *the* Tang shu *of Liu Xu* 'Bodhidharma originally left home to protect the state. He entered the south seas and obtained the miraculous dharma of the Chan lineage. From Śākyamuni Buddha were transmitted a robe and a bowl as the token to be transmitted generation to generation.'[209] The Minister of State Pei Xiu 裴休 wrote in a [funerary] tablet for the Tang monk Guifeng [Zongmi], 'The Tathāgata Śākyamuni at the very end transmitted the eye of the dharma to Mahākāśyapa. He commanded that it be transmitted patriarch by patriarch and circulate separately in the world. It

---

[207] T.55.2145.65c21–22.

[208] Unattested elsewhere, to my knowledge.

[209] From Shenxiu's biography, *Jiu Tang shu*, j.191, liezhuan j. 141, 1424b, with some small omissions.

was not [transmitted] privately to Mahākāśyapa but beyond humans, gods, śrāvakas, and bodhisattvas. From Mahākāśyapa to Bodhidharma, there were twenty-eight patriarchs. Bodhidharma transmitted it, and [it was transmitted] on to Huineng as the sixth patriarch.'[210] Formerly, Li Hua 李華, an official of the Ministry of Personnel, was familiar with Tiantai calming and contemplation.[211] The meditation master Zhanran 湛然 and all the monks ordered Li to compose an epitaph for Xuanlang 玄朗 of Zuoqi 左溪, and at the beginning, his composition refers to Bodhidharma, saying that twenty-nine generations had inherited in turn the dharma of the Buddha-mind transmitted by Mahākāśyapa.[212] I know no one who reproaches him [for working out this lineage.] [783a16]

"The Sui [monk] Zhiyi also quoted from the *Meditation Sūtra* the meaning of the four accompanying [marks] to verify the four siddhānta [levels of understanding] of his teaching.[213] As for Zhizhe, he was particularly good at distinguishing the four teachings. He really is a great dharma master whose like would not appear for many generations. Had Dharmatrāta's way not been exalted enough and had he not been the patriarch, how could his words been quoted as proof? Xuanjue 玄覺, the great master of Yongjia 永嘉大師, originally studied the three views of Tiantai. His exegesis was refined and cultivated; he was an extraordinary monk. *That he learned to practice the three contemplations is seen in the* Tiantai sijiao yi 天台四教儀 *and the* Yongjia ji 永嘉集. The song of realization that he wrote says, 'Brightly, brightly the Buddha's command [came to] Caoqi.'[214] [783a22]

"The great dharma master Chengguan 澄觀, the national teacher Qingliang 清凉國師, once said, 'The sea of karma departs from thought and is transmitted by mind.'[215] Guifeng explains it by saying, 'This is the meaning of Bodhidharma transmitting mind to mind without relying on words or letters.'[216] The *Chanyuan quan* [and] *Zu tu* says, [Cheng]

---

[210] Correcting an apparent copyist's error of "Fei" 斐 for "Pei" 裴. *Quan Tangwen*, j. 743, 13a7–8, b2, 3. Qisong skips the description of transmission to Xuanlang and stops before Shenxiu is mentioned.

[211] On Li Hua, see Silvio Vita, "Li Hua and Buddhism," esp. 106–108.

[212] *Quan Tangwen*, j. 320, 1b8–9.

[213] Zhiyi does this in the *Miaofa lianhua jing xuanyi* 妙法蓮華經玄義, T.33.1716.687c11f. The four siddhanta are 1) ordinary, 2) individual, 3) theraputic or diagnostic, and 4) highest and most perfect.

[214] T.48.2014.396b18.

[215] *Huayan jing xingyuanpin shu* 華嚴經行願品疏, XZJ 7.810a5.

[216] XZJ 7.813a5–6. Qisong drops one phrase.

guan once studied under the great Chan worthy called Fubei 浮盃.[217] Some say he also studied with a meditation master at Wutai 五臺 called Wangming 亡名. For this reason, his words are so. [783a27]

"The great vinaya master Fashen 法慎 of Weiyang 維揚 also said, 'The calming and contemplation of Tiantai includes the meaning of all the sūtras. The dharma-gate of Mt. Dong 東山 is the vehicle of all the Buddhas. Form and emptiness are both forgotten; prajñā and samādhi both shine. It cannot be obtained and named.'[218] If the path of our true lineage is not ultimate, then how could the three great sages of our dynasty practice it so diligently? [783b2]

"From long ago, those who followed the Chan teaching include the Niutou 牛頭 patriarch [Fa]rong [法]融, [Lao]an [老]安, [Shen]xiu [神]秀, the great master Yixing 一行, [Yuan]gui of Mt. Song 嵩山[元]珪, the national teacher of Nanyang 南陽國師 [i.e., Huizhong 慧忠] and Daji of Jiangxi 江西大寂 [i.e., Mazu Daoyi 馬祖道一].[219] Masters like these are innumerable. Their teachings were popular in the world and their virtues compare to those of the spirits. Though rulers prostrate in respect, [these masters] remained lofty as the pillar and plinth. The teaching of the Buddha has become the great teaching brilliantly covering ten thousand generations. From this, we can also divine the state of his dharma. Even if its teaching is too mysterious, scholars fail to understand it; why do they not think a little? [783b8]

"Now up to the time of the sagely Son of Heaven, all the scholastic masters of the Sui and Tang, what they have taken this to mean, they can take to admonish themselves. First the vinaya master Daoxuan took Bodhidharma to be an eminent monk for cultivating dhyāna. This already lowers him too much. Further, he did not list the lineage of dharma masters inheriting his dharma. I was once worried about his unfairness, but the record of monks by our Song [monk] Zanning continued Daoxuan's account.[220] He judges the three teachings say-

[217] The titles of two of Zongmi's works mixed together. I can find the following lines in neither and have found no information on either of the figures mentioned.

[218] He is also known as Huairen 懷仁; these lines come from his epitaph by Li Hua (*Song gaoseng zhuan*, T.50.2061.796b23–24, with slight changes).

[219] This list is a curious assortment of figures from Chan history: a student of Daoxin, a student of Hongren and a student of his, Hongren's student Shenxiu and his student Puji's student Yixing, a student of Huineng's and then Mazu. None of them come from the Shitou line which leads to Qisong's own line.

[220] Reading *zong* 宗 as a mistake for *Song* 宋, as suggested by the palace edition.

ing that the teaching of the mind is superior in teaching.[221] *He calls the three vehicles of sūtras, vinaya, and śāstras the manifest teaching. He calls the dharma of the matrix and diamond maṇḍalas the hidden teaching. He calls the direct pointing to the human mind, seeing the nature and becoming a Buddha of the Chan lineage. This is the mind teaching.*[222] For this reason, in discussing material on the practice of Chan, he especially respects the lineage of Bodhidharma, saying, 'To practice and realize like this is the dhyāna of the supreme vehicle.'[223] He also says, 'This thing called Chan is great! All the buddhas attained it, ascending to complete awakening. This is because, nothing surpasses the gate of rapid [awakening].'[224] [783b16]

"I examined what Zanning wrote of the records of the worthies of Eagle Peak. Although he discusses the patriarchs of the lineage of the transmission of the dharma, he is probably following the two accounts, the *Baolin zhuan* and the *Fu fazang zhuan*. There are no different stories. However, his judgment is superficial, and the standard of right and wrong is not clear. In the end, he is unable to investigate deeply the great sūtras and commentaries and thereby verify the true meaning of the Buddha. He makes the scholars of later generations increasingly suspicious. This is also the shortcoming of the two ancient [works, the *Fu fazang zhuan* and *Baolin zhuan*]. [783b21]

"Nowadays, despite the decline of the lineage-gate, there are many self-proclaimed, unqualified 'Chan masters.' The qualified masters are really rare. For the scholars who are knowledgeable, they must respect and follow the sage intentions of former buddhas. How could they take pleasure in the decline of Chan, take advantage of its lack of good masters, ignore the great lineage and great patriarchs, and profane the substance of the dharma-gate? Can this be called knowledge? A worldly book says, 'Ci! You regret the loss of the lamb, whereas I regret the loss of the rite.'[225] This is also not forgetting the way of these sages. Those who study it have little considered it. [783b26]

---

[221] This may be a garbling of T.50.2061.724b22.

[222] Summary and rearrangement of T.50.2061724b16–19.

[223] T.50.2061.789c3–4.

[224] T.50.2061.789c18–19, skipping a line in the middle.

[225] *Analects* 3.17. Following Slingerland, *Analects*, 24. Confucius' student Zigong, also known as Ci, wanted to stop sacrificing a lamb in a ritual in which the beginning of each month is announced to ancestors. Qisong sees himself as akin to Confucius in the desire to preserve the tradition against foolish changes.

"In the beginning, Bodhidharma succeeded in making his way flourish in the Wei. Emperor Wu of the Liang sent a letter to the Wei, saying, 'Let us rely on Guanyin and transform the world together.' Moreover, it says the great master Shengzhou [i.e., Bodhidharma].[226] The dharma master Huiyuan composed a preface for the *Meditation Sūtra* saying, 'Who, if not a person whose path excels in the three vehicles and whose knowledge extends to the ten stages [of the bodhisattva path], could penetrate the mysterious basis of the dharma-kaya and return to the oneness of the formless?'[227] Like this then, Bodhidharma is in fact a sage. An exalted person like Emperor Wu of the Liang and a sage and worthy person like Huiyuan who have praised him can be trusted. I see they always play with Bodhidharma. How imprudent! Bodhidharma appeared in the generations after the Tathāgata. However, his work is called the *Meditation Sūtra*. His text is so named because he used many sūtras for the purpose of taking the words of the Buddha as a standard and awakening the faith of later generations. For this reason, Huiyuan's preface says, '[They] sought and gathered the essence of sūtras in order to disseminate the great vehicle with zeal.'[228] This is the verification."

[226] I have been unable to find sources for these quotations.
[227] T.55.2145.66a21–22.
[228] T.55.2145.66a12, with a variant character.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

Baolin zhuan 寶林傳 [Transmission of the Baolin [Monastery]]. By Zhiju 智炬. In YANAGIDA Seizan, *Hōrinden: Dentō gyokuei shū*.

Beishan lu 北山錄 [Beishan Record]. By Shenqing 神清. T.52.2113.

Chanlin sengbao zhuan 禪林僧寶傳. By Juefan Huihong 覺範慧洪. ZZ 2b.10.3.

Chanyuan zhuquanji duxu 禪源諸詮集都序 [Chan Preface]. By Zongmi 宗密. T.48.2015.

Chengweishi lun shuyao 成唯識論樞要. By Kuiji 窺基. T.43.1831.

Chu sanzang ji ji 出三藏記集 [Compilation of Notes on the Translation of the Tripitika]. By Sengyou 僧祐. T.55.2145.

Chuan fabao ji 傳法寶記 [Chronicle of the Transmission of the Dharma Jewel]. By Du Fei 杜朏. In YANAGIDA Seizan, *Shoki zenshū shisho no kenkyū*, 559–93.

Chuanfa zhengzong lun 傳法正宗論 [Critical Essay on the True Lineage of the Dharma Transmission]. By Qisong 契嵩. T.51.2080.

Chuanfa zhengzong ji 傳法正宗記 [Record of the True Lineage of the Dharma Transmission]. By Qisong 契嵩. T.51.2078.

Chuanfa zhengzhong dingzu tu 傳法正宗定祖圖 [Chart Establishing the Patriarchs of the True Lineage of the Dharma Transmission]. By Qisong 契嵩. T.51.2079.

Daban niepan jing 大般涅槃經 [Nirvāṇa Sutra]. T.12.375.

Dacheng silun xuanyi 大乘四論玄義. By Junzheng 均正. ZZ 74.1.1.

Dacheng xuanlun 大乘玄論. By Jizang 吉藏. T.45.1853.

Da fangguang yuanjue xiuduo liaoyi jing 大方廣圓覺修多了義經. T.17.842.

Da fangguang yuanjue xiuduo liaoyi jing lueshu 大方廣圓覺修多了義經略疏. By Zongmi 宗密. T.39.1795.

Damoduoluo chan jing 達摩多羅禪經 [Meditation Sutra of Dharmatrāta]. T.15.618.

Da zhidu lun 大智度論. T.25.1509.

Fozu lidai tongzai 佛祖歷代痛載. By Nianchang 念常. T.49.2036.

Fozu tongji 佛祖統記. By Zhipan 志磐. T.49.2035.

Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan 付法藏因緣傳 [Record of the Transmission of the Dharma-Treasury]. T.50.2058.

Fujiao bian 輔教編 [Essays to Aid the Teaching] in ARAKI Kengo 荒木見悟, ed. *Fuhyōben* (Zen no goroku 14). Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1981.

Huayan jing zhuanji 華嚴經傳記. By Fazang 法藏. T.51.2073.

Jianzhong jingguo xudeng lu 建中靖國續燈錄. By Foguo Weibai 佛國惟白. ZZ 2b.9.1.

Jingde chuandeng lu 景德傳燈錄 [Jingde Record of the Transmission of the Lamp]. By Daoyuan 道原. T.51.2076.

Lengqie shizi ji 楞伽師資記 [Record of the Masters and Disciples of the Laṅkā[vatāra]]. By Jingjue 淨覺. T.85.2837.

Lidai fabao ji 歷代法寶記 [Record of the Dharma-Jewel Throughout the Generations]. T.51.2075.

Linjian lu 林間錄. By Juefan Huihong 覺範慧洪. ZZ 2b.10.3.

"Longan [Ru]hai chanshi bei" 龍安[如]海禪師碑 [Epitaph for Chan Master [Ru]hai of Longan]. By Liu Zongyuan 柳宗元,. In *Liu hedong ji* 柳河東集, 20–2, in *Wanyou wenku huiyao* 萬有文庫薈要, v. 833 (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1965).

Luohu yelu 羅湖野錄. By Zhongwen Xiaoying 仲溫曉瑩. ZZ 2b.15.5.

"Lushan chu xiuxing fangbian chanjing tongxu" 廬山出修行方便禪經統序 [General Preface to Xiuxing fangbian chanjing translated at Lushan]. By Huiyuan 慧遠. T.15.618.301a–b (untitled) and T.55.2145.65b–66a.

"Mingjiao dashi xingye ji" 明教大師行業記 [Account of the Conduct and Accomplishments of the Great Master Mingjiao]. By Chen Shunyu 陳舜俞. In Chen's collected works, *Duguan ji* 都官集, j. 8 (Qinding siku quanshu 欽定四庫全書, ji bu 集部 3) and *Tanjin wenji* 鐔津文集 [Collected Works of [Qisong of] Tanjin], T.52.2115.648a–c.

Mohemoye jing 摩訶摩耶經 [Mahāmāyā Sutra]. T.12.383.

Mohesengqi lü 摩訶僧祇律 [Mahāsaṇghika Vinaya]. T.22.1425.

Mohe zhiguan [Great Calming and Contemplation]. By Zhiyi 智顗. T.46.1911.

Nanzong dunjiao zuishang dacheng tanjing 南宗頓教最上大乘壇經 [Stein Dunhung manuscript of the Platform Sutra]. In Philip B. Yampolsky, *Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch.*

Nanzong dunjiao zuishang dacheng tanjing 南宗頓教最上大乘壇經 [Dunhuang District Museum manuscript of the Platform Sutra]. In Pan Chonggui 潘重規, *Dunhuang Tanjing xinshu* 敦煌壇經新書 (Taipei: Fotuo jiaoyu jijin hui, 1994).

Putidamo nanzong ding shifei lun 菩提達摩南宗定是非論 [Treatise Establishing the True and the False]. Dugu Pei 獨孤沛. T.48.2007 and in *Shenhui heshang yiji* 神會和尚遺集, ed. HU Shih 胡適 (Taipei: Hu Shi jinian guan, 1970), 260–319.

Rentian baojian 人天寶鑑. By Tanxiu 曇秀. ZZ 2b.21.1.

Sanlun xuanyi 三論玄義 [The Mysterious Meaning of the Three Treatises]. By Jizang 吉藏. T.45.1852.

Sanlun youyi yi 三論遊意義. By Dharma Master Shi 碩法師. T.45.1855.

Shanjian lü piposha 善見律毘婆沙. By Saṃghabhadra 僧伽跋陀羅. T.24.1462.

Shimen zhengtong 釋門正統. By Zongjian 宗鑑. XZJ 130.

Shishi jigu lue 釋氏稽古略. By Juean 覺岸. T.49.2037.

Song gaoseng zhuan 宋高僧傳 [Biographies of Eminent Monks of the Song Dynasty]. By Zanning 贊寧. T.50.2061.

Song huiyao jigao 宋會要輯稿. Compiled by Xu Song 徐松. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1957.

"Tang zhongyue shamen Shi Faru chanshi xingzhuang" 唐中岳沙門釋法如禪師行裝 [Account of the Life of Tang Dynasty Chan Master Śramaṇa Shi Faru of the Zhong Mountains] by Li Hua 李華. In YANAGIDA Seizan, *Shoki zenshū shisho no kenkyū*, 487–96 and *Quan Tang wen* 320.1a–4b.

Tanjin wenji 鐔津文集 [Collected Works of [Qisong] of Tanjin]. By Qisong 契嵩. T.52.2115.

"Xiuxingdi bujingguan jing xu" 修行地不淨觀經序 [Preface to the Xiuxingdi bujingguan jing]. By Huiguan 慧觀. T.55.2145.66b–67a.

Xu chuandeng lu 續傳燈錄. By Juding 居頂. T.51.2077.504c.

Xu gaoseng zhuan 續高僧傳 [Continued Biographies of Eminent Monks]. By Daoxuan 道宣. T.50.2060.

Yunwo jitan 雲臥記談. By Xiaoying 曉瑩. ZZ 2b.21.1.

Zutang ji 祖堂集 [Patriarchs Hall Collection]. By Jing 静 and Yun 筠. In YANAGIDA Seizan, *Sodō shū.*

B. Secondary Sources

ABE Chōichi 阿部肇一. "Sōdai Butsunichi Kaisū ni tsuite" 宋代佛日契嵩について *Komazawa shigaku* 駒沢史学 8 (1959): 31–38.

——. *Chūgoku Zenshūshi no kenkyū* 中国禅宗史の研究. Tokyo: Kenbun shuppan, 1986.

——. "Sōdai no Rozan" 宋代の廬山, *Shūkyō gaku ronshū* 宗教学論集 13 (1987): 339–49).

Adamek, Wendi L. "Issues in Chinese Buddhist Transmissions As Seen through the *Lidai fabao ji* (Record of the Dharma-Jewel Through the Ages)," Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1997.

——. "Robes Purple and Gold: Transmission of the Robe in the *Lidai fabao ji* (Record of the Dharma-Jewel Through the Ages)." *History of Religions* 40.1 (August 2000): 58–81.

——. *The Mystique of Transmission: On an early Chan history and its contexts*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.

Adikaram, E.W. *The Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, 2nd ed. Colombo: Gunasena, 1953.

ANDŌ Tomonobu 安藤智信. "Kozan Chien to Myōkyō Kaisū: Sōdai nikōsō ni miru Ju-Butsu nikyō no ichi zuke" 弧山智円と明教契嵩：宋代二高僧に見る儒佛二教の位置ずけ. *Ōtani gakuhō* 大谷学報 55.3 (December 1975): 39–51.

——. "Butsunichi Meikyō Kaisū shikō" 佛日明教契嵩私考. *Ōtani daigaku kenkyū nenpu* 大谷大学研究年譜 29 (1976): 91–133.

ANDŌ Toshio 安藤俊雄. *Tendaigaku ronshū* 天台学論集. Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten, 1975.

AOYAMA Sadao 青山定雄. *Dokushi hōyo kiyō sakuin Shina rekidai chimei yōran* 讀史方與紀要索引支那歷代地名要覧. Tokyo: Tōyō bunka gakuin, Tōkyō Kenkyūjo, 1933. Reprint, Taibei: Letian shuju, 1974.

App, Urs. *Master Yunmen*. New York: Kodansha International, 1993.

ARAKI Kengo 荒木見悟, ed. *Fuhyōben* (Zen no goroku 14). Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1981.

ARAMAKI Noritoshi 荒牧典俊. "*Hokuzan roku* no tachiba to 'Nanshūzen' izen no Nanshūzen" 「北山録」の立場と'南宗禅'以前の南宗禅. In *Tōdai no shūkyō* 唐代の宗教, ed. Yoshikawa Tadao. Kyoto: Hoyu shoten, 2000.

Balazs, Étienne. *Chinese Civilization and Bureaucracy*, trans. H.M. Wright. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.

Bareau, André. Trans. Sara Boin-Webb. "Devadatta and the First Buddhist Schism," *Buddhist Studies Review* 14:1 (1997): 19–37. [Orig. "Devadatta et le premier schisme bouddhisque," *Oriente e Occidente (Pūrvāparam)* (Marsala) 12–13 (1989–90): 1–14.]

Barrett, T.H. "Kill the Patriarchs!" In *The Buddhist Forum*, ed. Tadeusz Skorupski, 87–97. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1989.

——. "The Date of the *Leng-chia shih-tzu chih*." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 3rd ser., 1.2 (1991): 255–9.

——. *Li Ao: Buddhist, Taoist, or neo-Confucian?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

——. "The Emergence of the Taoist Papacy in the T'ang Dynasty," *Asia Major* (3rd ser.) 7.1 (1994): 89–106.

——. "Exploratory Observations on Some Weeping Pilgrims." In *The Buddhist Forum*, ed. Tadeusz Skorupski, 99–110. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1996.

——. Review of Thomas A. Wilson, *Genealogy of the Way*. In *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 59.3 (1996): 598.

——. Review of *Seeing through Zen: Encounter, Transformation, and Genealogy in Chinese Chan Buddhism*, by John R. McRae. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 67 (2004): 421–23.

Benn, James A. *Burning for the Buddha: Self-Immolation in Chinese Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2007.

Berkowitz, Alan J. *Patterns of Disengagement: The Practice and Portrayal of Reclusion in Early Medieval China*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.

Berling, Judith A. "Bringing the Buddha Down to Earth: Notes on the Emergence of 'Yü-lu' as a Genre." *History of Religions* 27.1 (August 1987): 56–88.

Bodiford, William. “Dharma Transmission in Theory and Practice” in *Zen Ritual: Studies of Zen Buddhist Theory in Practice*, eds. Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2008. 261–282.
Bol, Peter. *“This Culture of Ours”*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992.
——. Review of Thomas A. Wilson, *Genealogy of the Way*. In *China Review International* 3.2 (Fall 1996): 564–72.
Borgen, Robert. “Court Culture, Conventional Wisdom, and the Sources of Japanese Zen.” In *Selected essays on Court Culture in Cross-Cultural Perspective*, 233–53. Taipei: National Taiwan University Press, 1999.
Bossler, Beverly J. *Powerful Relations: Kinship, Status and the State in Sung China (960–1279)*. Cambridge: Harvard University Council on East Asian Studies, 1998.
Bowring, Richard. “Buddhist Translations in the Northern Sung.” *Asia Major* (3rd ser.) 5.2 (1992): 79–93.
Brook, Timothy. *Praying for Power: Buddhism and the Formation of Gentry Society in Late-Ming China*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.
Broughton, Jeffrey Lyle. “Kuei-feng Tsung-mi: The Convergence of Ch’an and the Teachings.” Ph.D. diss., Columbia University diss., 1975.
——. *Zongmi on Chan*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.
Buswell, Robert E., Jr. *The Formation of Ch’an Ideology in China and Korea*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.
Campany, Robert Ford. “On the Very Idea of Religions (in the Modern West and in Early Medieval China).” *History of Religions* 42.4 (2003): 287–319.
——. “Secrecy and Display in the Quest for Transcendence in China, ca. 220 BCE–350 CE.” *History of Religions* 45.4 (May 2006): 291–336.
Carsten, Janet. *After Kinship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
Chaffee, John W. “Chu Hsi and the Revival of the White Deer Grotto Academy, 1179–81 A.D.” *T’oung Pao* 71.1–3 (1985): 1–43.
——. *The Thorny Gates of Learning in Sung China: A Social History of Examinations*, 2nd ed. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995.
——. *Branches of Heaven: A History of the Imperial Clan of Sung China*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
Chan, Chi-wah. “Chih-li (960–1028) and the formation of orthodoxy.” Ph.D. diss., UCLA, 1993.
Chan, Hing-ho. “Lo-hu yeh-lu.” In *A Sung Bibliography*, ed. Yves Hervouet, 355–6. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Chinese University Press, 1978.
Chappell, David W. “Early Forebodings of the Death of Buddhism.” *Numen* 27.1 (1980): 122–54.
Chaves, Jonathan. *Mei Yao-ch’en and the Development of Early Sung Poetry*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1976.
Chen, Jinhua. *Making and Remaking History: A Study of Tiantai Sectarian Historiography*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1999.
——. *Monks and Monarchs, Kinship and Kingship: Tanqian in Sui Buddhism and Politics*. Kyoto: Italian School of East Asian Studies, 2002.
——. “Fame and Obscurity: The Creation of the Legends and Ideologies about the Third Ch’an Patriarch.” Forthcoming.
CHEN Yuan 陳垣. *Zhongguo Fojiao shiji gailun* 中國佛教史籍概論. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1988.
Clarke, Shayne Neil. “Family Matters in Indian Monastic Buddhism.” University of California-Los Angeles Ph.D. diss., 2006.
Cleary, J.C. *Zen Dawn: Early Zen Texts from Tun Huang*. Boston: Shambhala, 1986.
Cole, Alan. “Upside Down/Right Side Up: A Revisionist History of Buddhist Funerals in China.” *History of Religions* 35 (May 1996): 307–38.
——. *Mothers and Sons in Chinese Buddhism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

——. Review of Jamie Hubbard, *Absolute Delusion, Perfect Buddhahood*. *Journal of Asian Studies* 60.3 (August 2001): 838–40.
——. *Fathering Your Father: The Zen of Fabrication in Tang China*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009.
D'Argenio, Linda. "Poetry in Transition: Views and Practice of Poetic Writing during the Early Song Dynasty (960–1022)." *Culture* 17 (2003).
Davis, Edward L. "Arms and the Dao, 2: The Xu Brothers in Tea Country." In *Daoist Identity: History, Lineage, and Ritual*, eds. Livia Kohn and Harold D. Roth, 149–164. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002.
Davis, Richard L. "Sung Historiography: Empirical Ideals and Didactic Realities." *Chinese Culture* 29.4 (1988): 67–80.
DeBlasi, Anthony. "A parallel world: a case study of monastic society, Northern Song to Ming." *Journal of Sung-Yuan Studies* 28 (1998): 155–75.
Deleanu, Florin. "Śrāvakayāna Yoga Practices and Mahāyāna Buddhism." *Bulletin of the Graduate Division of Literature of Waseda University* 20 (1993): 3–12.
Demiéville, Paul. "Appendice sur 'Damoduoluo' (Dharmatrā[ta])." In *Peintures monochromes de Tun-huang (Dunhuang baihua)*, eds. Jao Tsong-yi and Paul Demiéville. Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient, 1978.
Derris, Karen Anne. "Virtue and Relationship in a Theravādin Biography of the Bodhisattva: A Study of the Sotatṭhakīmahānidāna," Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 2000.
Donner, Neal and Daniel B. Stevenson. *The Great Calming and Contemplation*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, 1993.
DU Jiwen 杜繼文 and WEI Daoru 魏道儒. *Zhongguo chanzong tongshi* 中國禪宗通史. Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chubanshe, 1993.
Ebrey, Patricia Buckley. *The Inner Quarters: Marriage and the Lives of Chinese Women in the Sung Period*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
——. *Women and the Family in Chinese History*. London: Routledge, 2002.
Faure, Bernard. *The Rhetoric of Immediacy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.
——. "Quand l'habit fait le moine: the symbolism of the kāśāya in Sōtō Buddhism," *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 8 (1995): 335–69.
——. *The Will to Orthodoxy: A Critical Genealogy of Northern Chan Buddhism*, trans. Phyllis Brooks. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997.
Feinberg, Richard and Martin Ottenheimer, eds. *The cultural analysis of kinship: the legacy of David M. Schneider*. Campaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2001.
Fisher, Carney. "The Ritual Dispute of Sung Ying-tsung." *Papers on Far Eastern History* 36 (1987): 109–38.
Foulk, T. Griffith. "The 'Ch'an School' and Its Place in the Buddhist Monastic Tradition." Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1987.
——. "The Ch'an Tsung in Medieval China: School, Lineage, or What?" *The Pacific World* (n.s.) 8 (1992): 18–31.
——. "Myth, Ritual, and Monastic Practice." In *Religion and Society in T'ang and Sung China*, eds. Patricia Buckley Ebrey and Peter N. Gregory, 147–208. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, 1993.
——. "Controversies Concerning the 'Separate Transmission.'" In *Buddhism in the Sung*, eds. Peter N. Gregory and Daniel A. Getz, Jr., 220–94. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999.
——. "Ch'an Myths and Realities in Medieval Chinese Buddhism." Unpublished manuscript.
Foulk, T. Griffith and Robert H. Sharf. "On the Ritual Use of Ch'an Portraiture in Medieval China." *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 7 (1993–94): 149–219.
Getz, Daniel A., Jr. "Siming Zhili and Tiantai Pure Land in the Song Dynasty." Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1994.

Gimello, Robert M. "Chih-yen and the foundations of Hua-yen Buddhism." Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1976.
——. "Random Reflections on the 'Sinicization' of Buddhism." *Society for the Study of Chinese Religions Bulletin* 5.1 (Spring 1978): 52–89.
——. "Li T'ung-hsüan and the Practical Dimensions of Hua-yen." In *Studies in Ch'an and Hua-yen*, eds. Robert M. Gimello and Peter N. Gregory, 321–89. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1983.
——. "Mārga and Culture: Learning, Letters, and Liberation in Northern Sung Ch'an." In *Paths to Liberation: The Mārga and Its Transformations in Buddhist Thought*, eds. Robert E. Buswell, Jr. and Robert M. Gimello, 371–437. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, 1992.
——. "Notes on the Relationship Between T'ien-t'ai Buddhism and Northern Sung Literati Culture." Unpublished paper prepared for a 1996 conference on "Buddhism and the Sung" held at the University of Illinois.
Gombrich, Richard. "The Significance of Former Buddhas in the Theravādin Tradition." In *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Walpola Rahula*, ed. S. Balasuriya, 62–72. London: Gordon Fraser, 1980.
——. "Why Six Former Buddhas?" *Journal of Oriental Research* (Madras) 56–7 (1992): 326–30.
——. "Freedom and Authority in Buddhism" in *Freedom and authority in religions and religious education*, ed. Brian Gates. London: Cassell, 1996, 10–17.
Granoff, Phyllis. "Religious Biography and Clan History among the Śvetāmbara Jains in North India." *East and West* (Rome) 39.1–4 (Dec. 1989): 195–215.
Grant, Beata. *Mt. Lu Revisited: Buddhism in the Life and Writings of Su Shih*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, 1994.
Gregory, Peter N. *Tsung-mi and the Sinification of Buddhism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.
——. "The Vitality of Buddhism in the Sung." In *Buddhism in the Sung*, ed. Peter N. Gregory and Daniel A. Getz, Jr., 1–20. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999.
Guarino, Marie. "Learning and Imperial Authority in Northern Sung China (960–1126): The Classics Mat Lectures." Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1994.
Guy, R. Robert. *The Emperor's Four Treasures: Scholars and the State in the Late Ch'ien-lung Era*. Cambridge: Harvard University Council on East Asian Studies, 1987.
Gyatso, Janet. "The Logic of Legitimation in the Tibetan Treasure Tradition." *History of Religions* 33.2 (Nov. 1993): 97–134.
Hakeda, Yoshito. *The Awakening of Faith*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1974.
Halperin, Mark Robert. "Pieties and Responsibilities: Buddhism and the Chinese Literati, 780–1280." Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1997.
——. *Out of the Cloister: Literati Perspectives on Buddhism in Sung China, 960–1279* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2006.
Hartman, Charles. *Han Yü and the T'ang Search for Unity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.
Hatch, George C. "Su Shih." In *Sung Biographies*, ed. Herbert Franke, v. 3, 900–968. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1976.
Heine, Steven. "Did Dōgen Go to China? Problematizing Dōgen's Relation to Ju-ching and Chinese Ch'an." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 30.1–2 (2003): 27–59.
Heller, Nathasha. "'Illusory Abiding': The Life and Work of Zhongfeng Mingben (1263–1323)," Harvard Univ. diss,. 2005.
HIRAI Shun'ei 平井俊榮. *Hokke mongu no seiritsu ni kansuru kenkyū* 法華文 句の成立に関する研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1985.

Hobsbawn, Eric and Terence Ranger, eds. *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
Holzman, Donald. “Shen Kua and His Meng-ch’i pi-t’an.” *T’oung Pao* 46 (1958): 261–292.
Horner, I.B. *The Book of the Discipline*. London: Pali Text Society, 1940.
Hsieh, Ding-hwa. “Images of Women in Ch’an Buddhist Literature of the Sung Period.” In *Buddhism in the Sung*, ed. Peter N. Gregory and Daniel A. Getz, Jr., 148–87. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1999.
Hsieh, Shan-yuan. *The life and thought of Li Kou, 1009–1059*. San Francisco: Chinese Materials Center, 1979.
——. [謝善元]. *Li Gou zhi sheng ping ji sixiang* 李覯之生平及思想. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1988.
HU Shih. “Development of Zen Buddhism in China.” *Chinese Social and Political Science Review* 15.4 (January 1932): 475–505.
——. [胡適], ed. *Shenhui heshang yiji* 神會和尚遺集. Taibei: Hu Shih jinianguan, 1970.
——. “Putidamo kao” 菩提達摩考. In *Hu Shi chanxue an* 胡適禪學案, ed. Yanagida Seizan. Taipei: Zhengzhong shuju, 1975.
HUANG Chi-chiang. “Experiment in Syncreticism: Ch’i-sung (1007–1072) and Eleventh-Century Chinese Buddhism.” Ph.D. diss, University of Arizona, 1986.
——. “Shi-i shih-chi Kao-li sha-men I-t’ien ju Sung ch-iu-fa k’ao-lun” 十一世紀高麗沙門義天入宋求法考論. *Xin shixue* 新史學 2.2 (June 1991): 53–74.
——. “Imperial Rulership and Buddhism in the Early Northern Sung.” In *Imperial rulership and cultural change in imperial China*, eds. Frederick Brandauer and Huang Chun-chieh, 149–58. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1994.
——. *Bei Song fojiao shi lungao* 北宋佛教史論稿. Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1997.
——. “Elite and Clergy in Northern Sung Hang-chou: A Convergence of Interest.” In *Buddhism in the Sung*, ed. Peter N. Gregory and Daniel A. Getz, Jr., 295–339. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1999.
——. “Chung-yung in Northern Sung Intellectual Discourse: The Buddhist Components.” In C*lassics and interpretation: the hermeneutic traditions in Chinese culture*, ed. Ching-i Tu, 315–37. New Brunswick, Transaction Pub., 2000.
——. “Ŭich’ŏn’s Pilgrimage and the Rising Prominence of the Korean Monastery in Hang-chou during the Sung and Yüan Periods” *Currents and Countercurrents: Korean Influences on the East Asian Buddhist Traditions*, ed. Robert E. Buswell, Jr., 242–76. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2005.
HUANG Min-chih 黃敏枝. *Songdai fojiao shehui jingji shi lun ji* 宋代佛教社會經濟史論集. Taipei: Taiwan xuesheng, 1989.
Hubbard, Jamie. *Absolute Delusion, Perfect Buddhahood: The Rise and Fall of a Chinese Heresy*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2001.
Hucker, Charles O. *A Dictionary of Official Titles in Imperial China*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985.
Hurvitz, Leon. “Chih-i (538–597): An Introduction to the Life and Ideas of a Chinese Monk.” *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 12 (1962): 1–372.
Ikesawa Jiko 池澤滋子. Trans. Zeng Zaozhuang 曾棗莊. “Ding Wei nianpu” 丁謂年譜. *Songdai wenhua yanjiu* 宋代文化研究 6 (1996): 266–305.
ISHIJIMA Takao 石島尚雄. “Dōgen zen to Unmon shū no kansuru ikkōsatsu” 道元禅と運門宗関する一考察. *Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyū* 48.1 (December 1999): 97–101.
Jan, Yün-hua. “Buddhist Historiography in Sung China.” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 114.2 (1964): 360–81.

——. “Ch’uan-fa Yuan: The Imperial Institute for Transmission of Buddha-dharma in Sung China.” In *Studies in Asian history and culture, presented to Dr. B.R. Chatterji on his eightieth birthday*, 70–93. Meerut: Meenakshi Prakashan, 1970.

——. “Tsung-mi: His Analysis of Ch’an Buddhism,” *T’oung Pao* 58.1 (1972): 1–54.

——. “Ch’i-sung.” In *Sung Biographies*, ed. Herbert Franke, 185–94. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1976.

——. “Hsin-chin wen-chi.” In *A Sung Bibliography*, ed. Yves Hervouet, 386–90. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Chinese University Press, 1978.

Ji, Xiao-bin. *Politics and Conservatism in Northern Song China: The Career and Thought of Sima Guang (A.D. 1019–1086)*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 2005.

Jia, Jinhua. *The Hongzhou School of Chan Buddhism in Eighth- through Tenth-Century China*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006.

JIANG Yibin 蔣義斌. *Songdai Ru-Shi tiaohelun ji paifo lun zhi yanjin* 宋代儒釋調和論及排佛論之演進. Taibei: Taibei shangwu, 1988.

Johnson, David. *The Medieval Chinese Oligarchy*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1977.

——. “The Last Years of a Great Clan: The Li Family of Chao chün in late T’ang and early Sung.” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 37.1 (June 1977): 5–102.

Jorgensen, John. “The ‘Imperial’ Lineage of Ch’an Buddhism: The Role of Confucian Ritual and Ancestor Worship in Ch’an’s Search for Legitimation in the Mid-T’ang Dynasty.” *Papers on Far Eastern History* 35 (March 1987): 89–133.

——. *Inventing Hui-neng, the Sixth Patriarch: Hagiography and Biography in Early Ch’an*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Keightley, David N. “Early Civilization in China: Reflections on How It Became Chinese” in *Heritage of China,* 15–54. Berkeley: University of California, 1990.

Keyworth, George A. “Transmitting the Lamp of Learning in Classical Chan Buddhism: Juefan Huihong (1071–1128) and Literary Chan.” Ph.D. diss., UCLA, 2001.

Kieschnick, John. *The Eminent Monk*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1997.

——. *The Impact of Buddhism on Chinese Material Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.

KIMURA Eiichi 木村英一. *Eon kenkyū* 慧遠研究. Tokyo: Sobunsha, 1960–62.

Kohn, Livia. *Laughing at the Tao: Debates among Buddhists and Daoists in Medieval China*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Koseki, Aaron K. “The concept of practice in San-lun thought: Chi-Tsang and the ‘concurrent insight’ of the two truths,” *Philosophy East and West* 31.4 (Oct. 1981): 449–66.

Lamotte, Étienne. *Histoire du Bouddhisme indien*. Louvain: Bibliothèque du Muséon, 1958.

——. *History of Indian Buddhism*, trans., Sara Webb-Boin. Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste, 1988.

Lee, Thomas H.C. *Education in Traditional China: A History*. Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section Four, Vol. 13. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

LI Zhiliang 李之亮. *Song Liangzhelu junshou nianbiao* 宋兩浙路郡守年表. Chengdu: Bashu shuban, 2001.

Lin, Li-kouang. *L’aide-mémoire de la vraie loi*. Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, 1949.

Link, Arthur E. “Hui-chiao’s ‘Critical Essay on the Exegetes of the Doctrines’ in the Kao-seng chuan.” In *“Nothing Concealed”: Essays in Honor of Liu Yü-yün*, ed. Frederic Wakeman, Jr., 53–9. San Francisco: Chinese Materials and Research Aids Service Center, 1970.

LIOU Guei-jie [Liu Guijie]. “Qisong sixiang yanjiu.” *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 2 (October 1988): 213–40.

Liu, James T.C. *Ouyang Hsiu, An Eleventh-Century Neo-Confucian*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1967.

LIU Lin. "Cai Xiang nianpu" 蔡襄年譜. In *Songdai wenhua yanjiu* 宋代文化研究, vol. 4, 144–88. Chengdu: Sichuan Daxue chubanshe, 1994.

Liu, Ming-wood. *Madhyamaka Thought in China*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994.

LO, Winston W. 羅文. "Songdai 'qianghan ruozhi' zhengce shishi yipie" 宋代'强幹弱枝'政策一瞥. [Kwangsi in Sung China: A Case Study of the Policy of Centralization]. *Journal of Oriental Studies* 10.1 (January 1972): 8–22.

Lusthaus, Dan. *Buddhist Phenomenology: A Philosophical Investigation of Yogācāra Buddhism and the Ch'eng Wei-shih lun*. London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2002.

MAKITA Tairyō 牧田諦亮. *Chūgoku kinsei Bukkyōshi no kenkyū* 中国近世仏教史の研究. Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten, 1957.

Maraldo, John C. "Is There Historical Consciousness Within Ch'an?" *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 12.2–3 (1985): 141–72.

——. "Hermeneutics and Historicity in the Study of Buddhism." *Eastern Buddhist* 19:1 (1986): 17–43.

Maspero, Henri. "Sur la date et l'authenticité du Fou fa tsang yin yuan tchouan." In *Mélanges d'Indianisme (offerte à S. Lévi par ses élèves)*, 129–49. Paris: E. Leroux, 1911.

McMullen, David L. *State and Scholars in T'ang China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

McNair, Amy. "The Sung Calligrapher Ts'ai Hsiang." *Bulletin of Sung-Yuan Studies* 18 (1986): 61–75.

McRae, John R. "The Oxhead School of Chinese Ch'an Buddhism: From Early Ch'an to the Golden Age." In *Studies in Ch'an and Hua-yen*, eds. Robert M. Gimello and Peter N. Gregory, 169–252. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1983.

——. *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch'an*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986.

——. Review of J.C. Cleary, *Zen Dawn*. *The Eastern Buddhist* (n.s.) 19.2 (1986): 138–46.

——. *Seeing Through Zen: Encounter, Transformation, and Genealogy in Chinese Chan Buddhism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

MOCHIZUKI Shinkō 望月信亨. *Bukkyō daijiten* 佛教大辭典, 10 vols. Tokyo: Sekai seiten kankō kyōkai, 1933–36.

Mollier, Christine. *Buddhism and Taoism Face to Face*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008.

Morrison, Elizabeth. "The Curious Fate of an Early Medieval Chinese Buddhist Text: Reconsidering the *Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan*," unpublished paper.

——. "Ancestors, Authority, and History: Chan Lineage in the Writings of Qisong (1007–1072.)" Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 2004.

Murck, Alfreda. *Poetry and Painting in Song China: The Subtle Art of Dissent*. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center for the Harvard-Yenching Institute, 2000.

NAKAMURA Hajime 中村元, ed. *Bukkyōgo daijiten* 佛教語大辭典. Tokyo: Tokyo shoseki, 1975.

Ñāṇamoli, Bhikkhu and Bhikkhu Bodhi, trans. *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha (Majjhima Nikāya)*. Boston: Wisdom, 1995.

Nattier, Jan. *Once Upon a Future Time*. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1991.

Neskar, Ellen. "The Cult of Worthies: A Study of Shrines Honoring Local Confucians Worthies in the Sung Dynasty (960–1279)." Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1993.

Ogata, Sohaku. *The Transmission of the Lamp: Early Masters*. Wolfeboro, N.H.: Longwood Academic, 1990.

OGISU Jundō 荻須純道. "Gohō no zensha Butsunichi Kaisū" 護法の禅者佛日契嵩. *Zen bunka* 禅文化 41: 74–80 (1966): 74–80.

ONO Genmyō 小野玄妙. *Bussho kaisetsu daijiten* 仏書解説大辞典, 12 vols. Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1932–36.

Orzech, Charles D. "The 'Great Teaching of Yoga,' the Chinese Appropriation of the Tantras, and the Question of Esoteric Buddhism," *Journal of Chinese Religions* 34 (2006): 29–78.

PAN Chonggui 潘重規. *Dunhuang Tanjing xinshu* 敦煌壇經新書 (Taipei: Fotuo jiaoyu jijin hui, 1994.

Penkower, Linda. "Making and Remaking Tradition: Chan-jan's Strategies Toward a T'ang T'ien-t'ai Agenda." In *Tendai daishi kenkyū: Tendai daishi sen yonhyakunen gokanki kinen shuppan*, ed. Tendai daishi kenkyū henshū i-inkai, 1–50. Kyoto: Tendai gakkai, 1997.

——. "In the Beginning…Guanding (561–632) and the Creation of Early Tiantai." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 23.2 (2000): 245–296.

Poceski, Mario. *Ordinary Mind as the Way: The Hongzhou School and the Growth of Chan Buddhism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Pryzluski, Jean. *Le concile de Rājagṛha*. Paris: Paul Guethner, 1926.

Pulleyblank, E.G. "Introduction to Chinese Historical Writing." In *Historians of China and Japan*, eds. W.G. Beasley and E.G. Pulleyblank. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

——. "Chinese Historical Criticism: Liu Chih-chi and Ssu-ma Kuang." In *Historians of China and Japan*, eds. W.G. Beasley and E.G. Pulleyblank, 135–66. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Reiter, Florian Caspar. "Der 'Bericht ober den Berg Lu' (Lu-shan chi) von Ch'en Shun-yu." Ph. D. diss., University of Munich, 1977.

——. "Bergmonographien als geographische und historische Quellen, dargestellt an Ch'en Shen-yüs 'Bericht ober den Berg Lu' (Lu-shan chi) aus dem 11 Jahrhundert." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morganländischen Gesellschaft* 130.2 (1980): 397–407.

REN Jiyu 任继愈. *Han Tang Fojiao sixiang lunji* 汉唐佛教思想论集, 2nd ed. Beijing: Renming chubanshe, 1973.

Rhys Davids, T.W. and Hermann Oldenberg, trans. *The Kullavagga*, vol. 20 of *Sacred Books of the East*, ed. F. Max Müller. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1885. Reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1969.

Robinson, Richard H. *Early Madhyamika in India and China*. Madison, Milwaukee, and London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.

Robson, James. "Imagining Nanyue: A religious history of the Southern Marchmount through the Tang dynasty (618–907)." Ph.D., diss., Stanford University, 2002.

——. *Power of Place: The Religious Landscape of the Southern Sacred Peak (Nanyue* 南嶽*) in Medieval China*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009.

——. "Monastic Spaces, Sacred Traces and Converted Places: Facets of Chinese Monastic Records." Forthcoming.

Schlütter, Morten. "A Study in the Genealogy of the Platform Sutra." *Studies in Central and East Asian Religions* 2 (1989): 53–114.

——. "Chan Buddhism in Song-Dynasty China (960–1279): The Rise of the Caodong Tradition and the Formation of the Chan School." Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1998.

——. "Inheritance Certificates, Dharma Transmission, and the Power of the Abbot." Paper presented at the AAR Meeting, Nashville, TN, November 20, 2000.

——. "Vinaya Monasteries, Public Abbacies, and State Control of Buddhism under the Song Dynasty (960–1279)." *Going Forth: Vinaya and Monastic Power in East Asian Buddhism*, ed. William M. Bodiford. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2005. 136–60.

——. "Transmission and Enlightenment in Chan Buddhism Seen Through the *Platform Sūtra* (*Liuzu tanjing*)." *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 20 (2007): 379–410.

——. *How Zen Became Zen: The Dispute over Enlightenment and the Formation of Chan Buddhism in Song-Dynasty China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai`i Press, 2008.

Schmidt-Glintzer, Helwig. *Die Identität der Buddhistischen Schule und die Kompilation Buddhistischer Universalgeschechten in China*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1982.

Schneider, David Murray. *A critique of the study of kinship*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1984.

Seidel, Anna K. "Den'e" in *Hōbōgirin*, vol. 8. Paris: Librairie d'Amerique et d'Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve; Tokyo: Maison Franco-Japonaise, 2003, 1171–8.

Sen, Tansen. *Buddhism, Diplomacy, and Trade: The Realignment of Sino-Indian Relations, 600–1400*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, 2003.

Shahar, Meir. "The Lingyin Si Monkey Disciples and the Origins of the Sun Wukong," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 52.1 (June 1992): 193–224.

Sharf, Robert H. *Coming to Terms with Chinese Buddhism: A Reading of the Treasure Store Treatise*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 2002.

——. "On Pure Land Buddhism and Ch'an/Pure Land Syncreticism in Medieval China." *T'oung Pao* 88 (2002): 282–331.

SHIINA Kōyū 椎名宏雄. "'Hokuzan roku' ni tsuite"「北山録」について. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 19.2 (1971): 430–4.

——. "Sō Genhan zenseki kenkyū (2)" 宋元版禅籍研究 (2). *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 26.2 (March 1978): 856–9.

——. "Hōrinden makikyū makijū no itsubun" 宝林伝巻九巻十の逸文. *Shūgaku kenkyū* 宗学研究 19.2 (1980): 191–8.

——. "'Hōrinden' itsubun no kenkyū"「宝林伝」逸文の研究. *Komazawa daigaku Bukkyō gakubu ronki* 駒沢大学仏教学部論記 11 (1980): 234–57.

——. "Hoku-Sō chokuhan daizōkyō to nyūzō zenseki" 北宋大蔵経と禅籍 *Shūgaku kenkyū* 宗学研究 29 (1987): 161–6.

——. Hongwu nanzang no nyuzō zenseki 洪武南蔵の入蔵禅籍. *Komazawa daigaku Zen kenkyūjo nenpū* 駒沢大学禅研究所年譜 17 (March 2006): 1–17.

Shinohara, Koichi. "Buddhism and Confucianism in Ch'i-sung's Essay on Teaching (Yüan-tao)." *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 9 (1982): 401–422.

——. "Zhiyuan's autobiographical essay, 'The Master of the Mean,'" In *Other Selves: Biography and Autobiography in Cross-cultural Perspective*. Phyllis Granoff and Koichi Shinohara, eds., 35–72. Mosaic Press, 1994.

——. "Illness and Self: Zhiyuan's Two Autobiographical Essays." In *Self, soul and body in religious experience*, eds. Albert I. Baumgarten, Jan Assmann, and Gedaliahu A.G. Stroumsa, 276–97. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998.

——. "From Local History to Universal History: The Construction of the Sung T'ien-t'ai Lineage." In *Buddhism in the Sung*, eds. Peter N. Gregory and Daniel A. Getz, Jr., 524–76. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999.

——. "Literary Construction of Buddhist Sacred Places: The Record of Mt. Lu by Chen Shunyu." *Asiatische Studien: Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Gesellschaft für Asienkunde* 53.4 (1999): 937–64.

——. "The Kāśāya Robe of the Past Buddha Kaśyapa in the Miraculous Instruction Given to Vinaya Master Daoxuan (596–667)." *Chung-hua Buddhist Journal* 13.2 (May 2000): 299–367.

Silk, Jonathan A. "Incestuous Ancestries: The Family Origins of Gautama Siddhārtha, Abraham and Sarah in Genesis 20:12, and the Status of Scripture in Buddhism," *History of Religions* 47.4 (May 2008): 253–281.

Sivin, Nathan. "Shen Kua: A Preliminary Assessment of His Scientific Thought and Achievements." In *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, vol. 12. Reprinted in *Sung Studies Newsletter* 13 (1977): 31–55.

Slingerland, Edward, trans. *Analects*. Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett, 2003.

Stevenson, Daniel B. "Protocols of Power: Tz'u-yün Tsun-shih (964–1032) and T'ien-t'ai Lay Buddhist Ritual in the Sung." In *Buddhism in the Sung*, eds. Peter N. Gregory and Daniel A. Getz, Jr., 340–408. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999.

Strong, John S. *The Legend of King Aśoka: A Study and Translation of the Aśokāvadāna*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

——. *The Legend and Cult of Upagupta: Sanskrit Buddhism in North India and Southeast Asia*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Subrenat, Jean-Jacques. "Shen Kua." In *Sung Biographies*, ed. Herbert Franke, v. 2, 857–63. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1976.

SUWA Gijun 諏訪義純. *Chūgoku nanchō Bukkyō shi no kenkyū* 中国南朝仏教史の研究. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1997.

SUZUKI Keizō 鈴木啓造. "Chūgoku ni okeru sōryo no shitei kankei ni tsuite" 中国における僧侶の師弟関係について *Shikan* 史観 57.8 (March 1960): 146–61.

SUZUKI Tetsuo 鈴木哲雄. *Tō Godai no zenshū shi* 唐五代の禅宗史. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha, 1984.

——. *Tō Godai zenshū shi* 唐五代禅宗史. Tokyo : Sankibo Busshorin, 1985.

TAKAO Giken 高雄義堅. *Sōdai bukkyō shi no kenkyū* 宋代仏教史の研究. Kyoto: Hyakkenen, 1975.

TANAKA Ryōshō 田中良昭. "*Shōchū shū* kō" 「聖冑集」考 *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 24.1(1975): 103–108.

——. "Relations between the Buddhist Sects in the T'ang Dynasty through Ms. P. 3913." *Journal asiatique* 269 (1981): 163–9.

——. *Tonkō zenshū bunken no kenkyū* 敦煌禅宗文献の研究. Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1983.

——. "*Shōchū shū* no rekishiteki seikaku"「聖冑集」の歴史的性格. *Komazawa daigaku Bukkyō gakubu kenkyū kiyo* 駒澤大學佛教學部研究紀要. 60 (2002): 31–52.

——. *Hōrinden yakuchū* 宝林伝訳注. Tokyo: Uchiyama shoten, 2003.

TANG Yongtong 湯用彤. *Han-Wei Liang-Jin Nanbeichao fojiao shi* 漢魏兩晉南北朝佛教史. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1938.

——. "Lun Zhongguo fojiao wu 'shizong'" 論中國佛教無'十宗' *Xiandai foxue* 現代佛學 4 (1962): 15–23.

——. "Zhongguo Fojiao zongpai wenti bulun" 中國佛教宗派問題补論 *Beijing daxue renwen xueke xuebao* 北京大學人文學科學报 5 (1963). Reprinted, *Tang Yongtong xuanji* 汤用彤选集, 361–9i. Tianjin: Tianjin renmin chubanshe, 1995.

TOKIWA Daijo 常盤大定. *Hōrinden no kenkyū* 寶林傳の研究. Tokyo: Kokusho kankōkai, 1934. Reprint, 1973.

——. *Shina Bukkyō no kenkyū* 支那仏教の研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1943.

Topley, Marjorie. "The Great Way of Former Heaven: A Group of Chinese Secret Religious Sects." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 26.2 (1963): 362–92.

Tsukamoto, Zenryū. "The Sramana Superintendent T'an-yao and His Time." Trans. Galen E. Sargent. *Monumenta Serica* 16.1–2 (1957): 363–96.

——. *A history of Early Chinese Buddhism*. Trans. Leon Hurvitz. Tokyo: Kodansha, 1985.

Ueda, S. "Li Kou." In *Sung Biographies*, ed. Herbert Franke, v. 2, 573–4. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1976.

Verellen, Franciscus. *Du Guangting (850–933): Taoïste de cour à la fin de la Chine médiévale*. Paris: Collège de France, 1989.

Vita, Silvio. "Li Hua and Buddhism." In *Tang China and Beyond: Studies on East Asia from the Seventh to the Tenth Century*, ed. Antonino Forte, 97–124. Kyoto: Italian School of East Asian Studies, 1988.

Vyatkin, Rudolf. "The Role of Traditions in Chinese Historiography." In *China, State and Society*, ed. Lev Petrovich Deliusin. Moscow: USSR Academy of Sciences, 1985.
Walshe, Maurice, trans. *The Long Discourses of the Buddha (Mahāparinibbāna Sutta)*. Boston: Wisdom, 1995.
WANG Yankun 王彦坤. *Lidai bihuizi huidian* 历代避讳字汇典, Zhengzhou, Henan: Zhongzhou guji chubanshe, 1997.
WEI Daoru 魏道儒. *Songdai chanzong wenhua* 宋代禅宗文化. Zhengzhou: Zhengzhou guji chubanshe, 1993.
——. "Cong lunli guan dao xinxing lun" 從倫理觀到心性觀. In *Zhong-Ri Fojiao xueshu huiyi lunwen ji (1985–1995)*, eds. Yang Zengwen and Kamata Shigeo, 469–74. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 1997.
WEI Songshan 魏嵩山. *Zhongguo lishi diming da cidian* 中國歷史地名大辭典. Guangzhou: Guangdong jiaoyu, 1995.
Weinstein, Stanley. "Imperial Patronage in the Formation of T'ang Buddhism." In *Perspectives on the T'ang*, eds. Arthur F. Wright and Denis Twitchett, 265–306. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1973.
——. "Schools of Chinese Buddhism." In *Encyclopedia of Religion* 2:484. New York: MacMillan, 1986.
Welch, Holmes. "Dharma Scrolls and the Succession of Abbots in Chinese Monasteries." *T'oung Pao* 50.1 (1963): 93–149.
Welter, Albert. "Zanning and Chan: The Changing Nature of Buddhism in Early Song China." *Journal of Chinese Religions* 23. (Fall 1995): 105–40.
——. "A Buddhist Response to the Confucian Revival." In *Buddhism in the Sung*, eds. Peter N. Gregory and Daniel A. Getz, Jr., 21–61. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999.
——. "The problem with orthodoxy in Zen Buddhism: Yongming Yanshou's notion of *zong* in the *Zongjing lu* (Records of the Source Mirror)." *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 31.1 (2002): 3–18.
——. *Monks, Rulers, and Literati: The Political Ascendancy of Chan Buddhism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
——. *The* Linji lu *and the Creation of Chan Orthodoxy: The Development of Chan's Records of Sayings Literature*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
Wilson, Thomas A. *Genealogy of the Way: The Construction and Uses of the Confucian Tradition in Late Imperial China*. Stanford: Stanford UniversityPress, 1995.
Wright, Arthur F. "Biography and Hagiography: Hui-chiao's Lives of Eminent Monks." In *Silver Jubilee Volume of the Zinbun Kagaku Kenkyusyo of Kyoto University*, 383–432. Kyoto: Zinbun kenkyusyo, 1954.
——. *Buddhism in Chinese History*. Stanford University Press, 1959.
Wright, Dale S. "Les récits de transmission du bouddhisme Ch'an et l'historiographie moderne," trans. Bernard Faure. *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 7 (1993–4): 105–114.
——. *Philosophical Meditations on Zen Buddhism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
Wu, Jiang. *Enlightenment in Dispute: The Reinvention of Chan Buddhism in Seventeenth-Century China*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
Yamabe, Nobuyoshi. "*The Sūtra on the Ocean-like Samādhi of the Visualization of the Buddha*: The Interfusion of the Chinese and Indian Cultures in Central Asia as Reflected in a Fifth Century Apocryphal Sūtra," Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1999.
Yampolsky, Philip B. *Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.
YANAGIDA Seizan 柳田聖山. *Shoki zenshū shisho no kenkyū* 初期禅宗史書の研究. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1967.

——. “Dai zōkyō to zenroku no nyūzō” 大蔵経と禅録の入蔵. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 20.1 (1970). Reprint, *Yanagida Seizan shū*, vol. 2 .Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1999.
——. *Shoki no zenshi I* 初期の禅史 I. Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1971.
——. *Shoki no zenshi II* 初期の禅史 II. Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1976.
——. *Sodō shū* 祖堂集. Kyoto: Chūbun shuppansha.
——. *Hōrinden: Dentō gyokuei shū* 宝林伝：伝統漁区栄. Kyoto: Chūbun shuppansha, 1975.
YANAGIDA Seizan 柳田聖山 and Shiina Kōyū 椎名宏雄. *Zengaku tenseki sōkan* 禅学典籍叢刊. Kyoto, Rinsen shoten, 2000.
Yoshinobu, Shiba. “Ts’ai Hsiang.” In *Sung Biographies*, ed. Herbert Franke, vol. 4, 1026–29. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1976.
Young, Stuart H. “Conceiving the Indian Buddhist Patriarchs in China.” Ph.D. diss, Princeton University, 2008.
Yü, Chün-fang. *The Renewal of Buddhism in China: Chu-hung and the Late Ming Synthesis*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.
——. Review of Alan Cole, *Mothers and Sons in Chinese Buddhism*. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 60.2 (2000): 333–50.
——. *Kuan-yin: The Chinese Transformation of Avalokiteśvara*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
ZHAN Xiuhui 詹秀惠. “*Luoyang qielan ji* de zuozhe yu chengshu niandai” 洛陽伽藍記 的作者與成書年代. *Guoli Zhongyong daxue wenxueyuan yuankan* 1 (June 1983): 51–61.
ZHANG Qingquan 張清泉. *Beisong Qisong de Ru-Shi ronghui sixiang* 北宋契嵩的儒釋融會思.想. Taipei: Wenjin chubanshe, 1998.
Ziporyn, Brook. “Anti-Chan Polemics in Post-Tang Tiantai.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 17.1 (1994): 26–65.
Zürcher, Erik. *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China*.
——. “Buddhism in China.” In *Buddhism and Asian History*, eds. Joseph M. Kitagawa and Mark D. Cummings, 139–67. New York: MacMillan, 1987.
——. “Buddhism and Education in T’ang Times.” In *Neo-Confucian Education: The Formative Stage*, eds. Wm. Theodore De Bary and John W. Chaffee, 19–56. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

INDEX